AFF CARDS

# Resolved: Violent revolution is a just response to political oppression.

## Topic Analysis

Resolved: Violent revolution is a just response to political oppression.

This resolution opens up an interesting and timely debate for LD’ers this year! Since the election of Donald Trump #resistance has been making some pretty large waves; as groups of pro-Trump supporters (often with white supremacist connections) have clashed with others identifying themselves as Antifa (or Anti-Facsists, another group with a long and storied history). While these clashes have been broadcast into our living rooms, it raises the specter of what the proper form of resistance to political oppression should be.

Debaters discussing this topic would be well served by delving into literature that explores the difference between “political oppression” and other forms of oppression, like “civil,” “legal,” or “social” oppression. Ostensibly, political oppression is a form of oppression that is connected to the political and legal structures, indicating that the government, in some form—supports or legitimates the oppression this is being discussed. Additional, questions surrounding violence are quite interesting in regards to this topic, particularly given the literature that argues that a response to oppression can never be violence. Further, thinkers who have often been associated with antifa and anarchist groups often argue that violence must be directed at a human, and would thus disqualify actions like the destruction of property.

The most obvious route to discuss this topic lies in the conversation between violent forms of resistance, and non-violent forms of resistance. This is a debate that has a long history, and is probably best exemplified in the American context in the debates between supporters of Malcom X and the supporters of Martin Luther King Jr., during the Civil Rights movement. Ultimately, this resolution proposes a discussion about the most efficacious, or “just” response to oppression—and is thus mostly a debate about different strategies. The Affirmative will be interested in advancing a perspective that includes violence amongst a range of possible options to resist oppression—while the Negative is probably best suited to argue that alternative resistance strategies are more valuable.

Importantly, the question of political oppression is not one that is likely to go away, and it tends to rear its head in difficult situations. A negative will probably not be well served by simply arguing that violence is bad—they should probably propose how they imagine oppressed groups might be able to effectively combat their oppression. Of course, discussions about the success and failure of political movements will be difficult, because the landscape of our present world, and the landscapes of the worlds of history are much different, and both are complex and regularly shifting.

In this file, you will find a variety of different approaches to the topic. The affirmative approaches the discussion from a pretty central route, arguing that violence is one possible response, and that it is a response that is necessary in order for non-violent activism to be successful. In a world without violent resistance, the affirmative might argue, then the non-violent protestors look like extremists. The negative approaches the resolution similarly. It starts by arguing that violence conducted by the oppressed cannot be properly categorized as violence, because it is in response to violence that has already occurred. From this perspective, the negative might argue, to say that the oppressed commit violence is to blame someone who is hit for and injury to the fist of the person who struck them. The negative then moves on to argue that violence backfires, as well as proposes non-violence as a better response to political oppression.

## Additional Readings

Quick Opening Read:

Farbstein 2014 (Susan H. [Professor of Law and Co-Director of the International Human Rights Clinic at Harvard Law School] "Reflections on the Question When, If Ever, Violence is Justified in Struggles for Political or Social Change" Harvard Human Rights Journal 27.1 (2014): 1-5)

Affirmative Readings:

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 58-139)

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79)

Negative Readings:

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. pp. 1-12)

Howes 2013 (Dustin Ells [David J. Kriskovich Professor of Political Science at Louisiana State University] "The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence" Perspectives on Politics 11.2 (June 2013): 427-426.)

Butler 2009 (Judith [American Philosopher] "The Claim of Nonviolence" Frames of War: When is Life Grievable? London: Verso. pp. 165-185)

## Definitions

There’s a book called Analyzing Oppression by Ann E. Cudd which is really good for the reciprocity argument if anyone wants to find a way to get it

#### Reciprocal Justice Definition:

“Justice.” Ethics Defined, Word Press, 26 Apr. 2015, www.ethicsdefined.org/opinion/justice-2/.

“considered post fact; as a means of reciprocity – correcting the scales to provide some equilibrium”

#### Definition of reciprocity:

“Reciprocal.” Merriam-Webster, Merriam-Webster, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reciprocal.

“serving to reciprocate : consisting of or functioning as a return in kind”

#### Discourse Definition:

Oxford, 08 “Discourse | Definition of Discourse in English by Oxford Dictionaries.” Oxford Dictionaries | English, Oxford Dictionaries, 2008, en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/discourse.

“A formal discussion of a topic in speech or writing.”

#### Political Oppression

Prilleltensky, Isaac, and Lev Gonick 1996. (Isaac Prilleltensky an award winning community psychologist and Dean of the School of Education and Human Development at the University of Miami and Lev Gonick works in the Department of Political Science at Wilfrid Laurier University.) “Polities Change, Oppression Remains: on the Psychology and Politics of Oppression.” International Society of Political Psychology, vol. 17, Mar. 1996. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3791946.pdf?refreqid=excelsior:4bd956f52c7232e5c83e89476f547b92.).

Political Oppression, which is the creation of material, legal, military, economic, and/or other social barriers to the fulfillment of self-determination, distributive justice, and democratic participation, results from the use of multiple forms of power by dominating agents to advance their own interests at the expense of persons or groups in positions of relative powerlessness.

#### Colonialism

Horvath, 1972. (Ronald J, Dr. Horvath taught in Ethiopia as well as at the University of California Santa Barbara, Michigan State University, and the University of Sydney. He is distinguished as having contributed to the study of colonialism and African development, “A Definition of Colonialism.” Current Anthropology. Vol. 13, No. 1 (Feb., 1972): p. 45-57).

It seems generally, if not universally, agreed that colonialism is a form of domination-the control by individuals or groups over the territory and/or behavior of other individuals or groups. (colonialism has also been seen as a form of exploitation, with emphasis on economic variables, as in the Marxist-Leninist literature, and as a culture-change process, as in anthropology; these various points of departure need not conflict, however, and the choice of domination as a focus here will not exclude the culture-change dimension of the phenomenon.) The idea of domination is closely related to the concept of power. Widespread accord also exists that colonialism refers to group domination and not to social relations and processes among sets of individuals at the family or subclan level. Two basic types of group domination can be distinguished: intergroup and intragroup domination. The criterion employed to differentiate the two is cultural homogeneity or heterogeneity. Intergroup domination refers to the domination process in a culturally heterogeneous society and intragroup domination to that in a culturally homogeneous society. In Britain, both inter- and intragroup domination can be found, more clearly so in the past than today. The domination of the English over the Welsh, Irish, and Scots was a clear example of intergroup domination. At the same time, within English society there exist clear strata (groups) among which a hierarchical arrangement of power, wealth, and status exist, in other words, intragroup domination. Since intragroup domination is not considered a form of colonialism, it is with inter- group domination that we are concerned. The important difference between colonialism and imperialism appears to be the presence or absence of significant numbers of permanent settlers in the colony from the colonizing power. (This distinction is in keeping with the thinking of others on the subject; see, e.g., Hobson 1902.) The domination of Latin America, North America, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the Asian part of the Soviet Union by European powers all involved the migration of permanent settlers from the European country to the colonies. These places were colonized. Most of Africa and Asia, on the other hand, was imperialized-dominated but not settled-and the countries involved are noticeably different today, in part, because of the nature of the domination process. Therefore, colonialism refers to that form of intergroup domination in which settlers in significant numbers migrate permanently to the colony from the colonizing power. Imperialism is a form of inter- group domination wherein few, if any, permanent settlers from the imperial homeland migrate to the colony.

#### Cultural Autonomy

Iftene, 2014. (Cristi, Assist.Prof., PhD, “Ovidius” University of Constanţa, “CULTURAL AUTONOMY INTO A MULTICULTURAL SPACE: ESTONIAN CASE.” Literature, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue. Vol. 2, (December 2014): p. 216-222).

Cultural autonomy is an autonomous self-government of cultural business of a group or minority. Thus, we can say that it is a personal autonomy limited to cultural affairs. It includes issues of identity such as: language or education. The minority decides freely on these issues and is run by the majority or by the laws issued by the State. The target is unequivocally free cultural development of the group. It is not necessary to transfer all powers to the minority. Cultural autonomy could, for example, be considered as school autonomy, if the minority considers this fact enough.The other part of the cultural autonomy could lead to the separation from the majority culture, minority isolation and unquestionably group alienation. However common knowledge and respect is represent a prerequisite for cohabitation.

#### Societal Progress

Noll 2014. (Heinz-Herbert (German sociologist and Director of the Social Indicators Research Centre) “Societal Progress” Encyclopedia of Quality of Life Research. 19 May 2014.-KL)

Societal progress is a normative concept and can be defined as the change or advancement of major conditions of societies and people's lives in a direction considered to be desirable based on prevailing values and goals of development.

#### Structural Violence, and violence in general, can be defined as a difference between the potential condition of a human being and the actual condition of that human being.

Galtung, Johan 1969. (Johan Galtung received a Ph.D. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in sociology at the University of Oslo. He has also received thirteen honorary doctorates in his lifetime. “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research.” Journal of Peace Research, vol. 6, no. 3, 1969, pp. 167–191. Sage Publications Ltd., journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/002234336900600301.).

As a point of departure, let us say that violence is present when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations. This statement may lead to more problems than it solves. However, it will soon be clear why we are rejecting the narrow concept of violence - according to which violence is somatic incapacitation, or deprivation of health, alone (with killing as the extreme form), at the hands of an actor who intends this to be the consequence. If this were all violence is about, and peace is seen as its negation, then too little is rejected when peace is held up as an ideal. Highly unacceptable social orders would still be compatible with peace. Hence, an extended concept of violence is indispensable but that concept should be a logical extension, not merely a list of undesirables. The definition points to at least six important dimensions of violence. But first some remarks about the use of the key words above, ’actual’ and ’potential’. Violence is here defined as the cause of the difference between the potential and the actual, between what could have been and what is. Violence is that which increases the distance between the potential and the actual, and that which impedes the decrease of this distance. Thus, if a person died from tuberculosis in the eighteenth century it would be hard to conceive of this as violence since it might have been quite unavoidable, but if he dies from it today, despite all the medical resources in the world, then violence is present according to our definition. Correspondingly, the case of people dying from earthquakes today would not warrant an analysis in terms of violence, but the day after tomorrow, when earthquakes may become avoidable, such deaths may be seen as the result of violence. In other words, when the potential is higher than the actual is by definition avoidable and when it is avoidable, then violence is present. When the actual is unavoidable, then violence is not present even if the actual is at a very low level. A life expectancy of thirty years only, during the neolithic period, was not an expression of violence, but the same life-expectancy today (whether due to wars, or social injustice, or both) would be seen as violence according to our definition.

#### Civil disobedience vs. revolutionary disobedience defined

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcolm X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79) P. 26 [MF]

There is extensive literature on civil disobedience which provides that individuals may disobey the law if the law is immoral, unconstitutional, or sacrilegious. This philosophy, however, is distinguished from revolutionary disobedience. Civil disobedience presupposes a general obligation to obey the system, whereas revolutionary disobedience presumes the system as a whole is oppressive and as such deserves no general obligation on the part of the oppressed to obey. In this sense, Malcolm advances a concept of resistance that does not fit into the conventional meaning of civil disobedience. For a contextual analysis of traditional civil obedience, see John Rawls, The Justification of Civil Disobedience, in Civil Disobedience: Theory and Practice (1969); Michael Walzer, The Obligation to Disobey, Ethics (April 1967); Abe Fortas, Concerning Dissent and Civil Obedience (1968); Harold Laski, The Dangers of Disobedience (1930); Mohandas Gandhi, Non-Violent Resistance (1964).

#### Definition of oppression

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

It defines oppression as a violation of human dignity and suggests that oppression be fought consistent with universally recognized human rights standards.

## Affirmative

### Affirmative Case

#### I affirm Resolved: Violent revolution is a just response to political oppression.

#### In order to affirm, I offer a value of JUSTICE defined by

“Justice | Definition of Justice in English by Oxford Dictionaries.” Oxford Dictionaries | English, Oxford Dictionaries, en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/justice.

as, “The quality of being fair and reasonable.”

#### I propose a criteria of eradicating structural violence, which is defined by

Chopra, Anayika 2014. (Anayika Chopra is a Graduate Student in the Sociology Department at South Asian University. “Structural Violence.” International Journal of Multidisciplinary Approach and Studies, vol. 1, no. 4, 2014. Open Academic Journals Index, oaji.net/articles/2015/887-1427175626.pdf.). CM

Despite its invisibility , structural violence is shaped by identifiable institutions, relationships, force fields, and ideologies, such as unequal market-based terms of trade between industrialized and non-industrialized nations, discriminatory laws , gender inequity and racism (Bourgois 2010 : 19). Structural violence occurs in a variety of ways that affect people throughout the social order. It is not to deny the fact that the effects of this kind of violence are more brutal on the poor people but the violent consequences of social power also affect other social groups in ways that are often not so visible because they are not so direct and also are not labeled as “violent acts” or considered as “normalized conditions of existence”. The term structural violence has also been used to designate people who experience violence owing to extreme poverty. Violence which includes the highest rate of disease and death, unemployment, homelessness, lack of education, powerlessness and shared fate of miseries (Klein man 2000:227).The examples of structural violence are myriad. Hence by examining the said cases , this paper makes an earnest attempt to work on the various avenues by which various social , economic institutions carry out strategies that tend to legitimize acts of violence against individuals and groups.

#### Contention One: Oppression convinces the oppressed of the justice of their own subjugation, resulting in even further psychological violence and misery.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79) CM

Malcolm identifies two distinct aspects of oppression : lack of control and denigration of human dignity. When a group of people lose control over such essentials of their life as who they are, how they live, where they live, whether they work, and the type of work they do, the results are feelings of disability and oppression. This feeling of helplessness occurs when the means of control are in the oppressors' hands. The oppressors use the media to manipulate the public perception of a target group giving the impression "that everyone in that community is a criminal." Once the negative image has been established, it becomes easier for the police to execute and for the public to accept even brutal measures against the oppressed. This feeling of defenselessness is not limited to encounters with the police. It permeates many other aspects of life when the oppressed lack control over economic, social, and political means. The oppressed experience a shared powerlessness when someone else runs the businesses for which they work, and someone else owns the buildings in which they live. The level of frustration increases when the economic resources of their communities are drained for the benefit of others. As extensive joblessness prevails among the oppressed, their image as a community is further stained. Myths and stereotypes are spun to exonerate the system from responsibility, labelling the oppressed "stupid, lazy, dirty, or untrustworthy." In addition to disabling the disadvantaged, oppression simultaneously empowers the oppressor. It transfers power from the oppressed to the oppressor, establishing a relationship of direct subjugation. Under slavery, one of the most extreme forms of oppression , the labor of the enslaved is directly consigned to the master. The powerlessness of the enslaved is indeed the power of the master. On a larger social scale, oppression provides a conduit to drain power from the oppressed to building the economic, social, and political strength of the oppressors. Foreign occupation, caste-system, apartheid, segregation, and other forms of oppression are powerful barricades to control the flow of social goods to the oppressed. In a duplicitous democracy, however, the acquisition of control is derived from more sophisticated forms of oppression. Overt methods of oppression are no longer used because the legal system has adopted formal equality renouncing oppression in the written law. Recognition of formal equality in the law, however, does not end oppression. In order to retain the best available benefits and opportunities, the oppressors develop new, more subtle sub-structural ways and means to carry on the enterprise of oppression These overt and covert modes identify the oppressed "as a separate class of persons." Moreover, they serve to disconnect the oppressed from the oppressors, creating two sets of residential areas, two sets of schools, and two sets of jobs - two sets of almost everything that matters in life. Sophisticated forms of oppression continue to exist so long as the oppressors are unwilling to share benefits of the system on a fair and equitable basis. Consequently, the formal system changes but the bottom-line for the oppressed does not. The oppressed remain on the margins of social life. Malcolm recognized this phenomenon stating, "the same things are happening to us in 1964 that happened in 1954, 1924, and in 1884." The second aspect of oppression is a systematic assault on the inherent human dignity of the oppressed. Dehumanization of the oppressed and lack of control over basic decisions in life work in tandem and are inseverable attributes of oppression . The oppressors create, defend, and reinforce social assumptions which portray the oppressed as inferior human beings lacking intelligence, virtue, and social skills. This attack on the human dignity of the oppressed is made to defend an uneven and unfair distribution of social goods, economic benefits, political power, and constitutional values. By alleging the inherent inferiority of the oppressed, the oppressors can claim, without guilt, a superior position in the social hierarchy. Such an assault on human dignity has a devastating effect on the oppressed. According to Malcolm, the oppressors begin to control the minds of the oppressed, and the oppressed begin to think about themselves just as the oppressors characterize them. Consequently, the oppressed internalize self-hatred manifested by hating their skin, hating their caste, hating their language, hating their religion, and indeed hating who they are and what they are. This hatred leads the oppressed to turn upon themselves blaming their own kind, and killing their own children, brothers, and sisters, as if it is their own race, their own caste, their own religion, and their own community had trapped them and brought them down. Thus, deep and enduring marks of inferiority and degradation eliminate the dignity of the entire group.

#### Contention Two: Nonviolence cannot succeed to attain justice for the politically oppressed.

#### Sub-Point A: The practice of non-violence in the face of oppression is a catastrophic error.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 58-139)

One may assume for the moment that such a gross distortion of reality is hardly the intent of even the hardiest pacifist polemicists, although it may well be an intrinsic aspect of their position. Worse than this is the inconsistency of nonviolent premises. For instance, it has been abundantly documented that nazi policy toward the Jews, from 1941 onward, was bound up in the notion that extermination would proceed until such time as the entire Jewish population within German occupied territory was liquidated.34 There is no indication whatsoever that nonviolent intervention/mediation from any quarter held the least prospect of halting, or even delaying, the genocidal process. To the contrary, there is evidence that efforts by neutral parties such as the Red Cross had the effect of speeding up the slaughter.35 That the Final Solution was halted at a point short of its full realization was due solely to the massive application of armed force against Germany (albeit for reasons other than the salvation of the Jews). Left to a pacifist prescription for the altering of offensive state policies, and the effecting of positive social change, "World Jewry" - at least in its Eurasian variants - would have suffered total extermination by mid-1946 at the latest. Even the highly symbolic trial of SS Colonel Adolph Eichmann could not be accomplished by nonviolent means, but required armed action by an Israeli paramilitary unit fifteen years after the last death camp was closed by Russian tanks.36 There is every indication that adherence to pacifist principles would have resulted in Eichmann's permanent avoidance of justice, living out his life in reasonable comfort until - to paraphrase his own assessment — he leapt into the grave laughing at the thought of having killed six million Jews.37 With reference to the Jewish experience, nonviolence was a catastrophic failure, and only the most extremely violent intervention by others saved Europe's Jews at the last moment from slipping over the brink of utter extinction. Small wonder that the survivors insist, "Never again!"

#### Sub-Point B: Nonviolent revolution cannot work without a violent component or subset.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 58-139)

Jackson's exceedingly honest, if more than passingly cynical, outlook was tacitly shared by King. The essential contradiction inherent to pacifist praxis is that, for survival itself, any nonviolent confrontation of state power must ultimately depend either on the state refraining from unleashing some real measure of its potential violence, or the active presence of some counterbalancing violence of precisely the sort pacifism professes to reject as a political option. Absurdity clearly abounds when suggesting that the state will refrain from using all necessary physical force to protect against undesired forms of change and threats to its safety. Nonviolent tacticians imply (perhaps unwittingly) that the "immoral state" which they seek to transform will somehow exhibit exactly the same sort of superior morality they claim for themselves (i.e., at least a relative degree of nonviolence). The fallacy of such a proposition is best demonstrated by the nazi state's removal of its "Jewish threat." Violent intervention by others divides itself naturally into the two parts represented by Gandhi's unsolicited "windfall" of massive violence directed against his opponents and King's rather more conscious and deliberate utilization of incipient antistate violence as a means of advancing his own pacifist agenda. History is replete with variations on these two subthemes, but variations do little to alter the crux of the situation: there simply has never been a revolution, or even a substantial social reorganization, brought into being on the basis of the principles of pacifism. In every instance, violence has been an integral requirement of the process of transforming the state. Pacifist praxis (or, more appropriately, pseudopraxis), if followed to its logical conclusions, leaves its adherents with but two possible outcomes to their line of action: 1. To render themselves perpetually ineffectual (and consequently unthreatening) in the face of state power, in which case they will likely be largely ignored by the status quo and self-eliminating in terms of revolutionary potential; or, 2. To make themselves a clear and apparent danger to the state, in which case they are subject to physical liquidation by the status quo and are self-eliminating in terms of revolutionary potential. In either event - mere ineffectuality or suicide - the objective conditions leading to the necessity for social revolution remain unlikely to be altered by purely pacifist strategies. As these conditions typically include war, the induced starvation of whole populations and the like, pacifism and its attendant sacrifice of life cannot even be rightly said to have substantially impacted the level of evident societal violence.

#### Contention Three: Violence is critical to successful revolution.

#### Sub-Point A: Oppression necessitates violent responses, and is crucial to long term success.

Hurwitz 16, Ana. “20 Ways the Violence of the Oppressed Isn't the Same as the Violence of the Oppressors.” 20 WAYS THE VIOLENCE OF THE OPPRESSED ISN’T THE SAME AS THE VIOLENCE OF THE OPPRESSORS, Collectively Free, 2 Feb. 2016, www.collectivelyfree.org/violence-of-the-oppressed/.

“The violence of the oppressed is part of achieving liberation. The violence of the oppressor is part of achieving domination. Revolution is a process. It’s not always victorious at first. Or sometimes ever. Jewish partisans didn’t win liberation from the Nazis when the Warsaw Ghetto uprising was crushed in 1943; two years later the Soviets defeated Germany. Mozambican communists didn’t win independence from Portugal when their uprising was crushed in 1974; a year later Mozambique won independence. The Kenyan Mau-Mau uprising didn’t win independence from Britain when it was crushed in 1960; three years later Kenya won independence. After five decades the Maoists of India still have yet to win defense of their indigenous lands against mining corporations. The examples are numerous. The violence of the oppressed is frequently a ‘necessary evil.”

#### Sub-Point B: Violence is the only response to political oppression that results in change, nonviolence condemns those who practice it to social, political, and biological death.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 58-139)

Violent intervention by others divides itself naturally into the two parts represented by Gandhi's unsolicited "windfall" of massive violence directed against his opponents and King's rather more conscious and deliberate utilization of incipient antistate violence as a means of advancing his own pacifist agenda. History is replete with variations on these two subthemes, but variations do little to alter the crux of the situation: there simply has never been a revolution, or even a substantial social reorganization, brought into being on the basis of the principles of pacifism.47 In every instance, violence has been an integral requirement of the process of transforming the state. Pacifist praxis (or, more appropriately, pseudopraxis), if followed to its logical conclusions, leaves its adherents with but two possible outcomes to their line of action: 1. To render themselves perpetually ineffectual (and consequently unthreatening) in the face of state power, in which case they will likely be largely ignored by the status quo and self-eliminating in terms of revolutionary potential; or, 2. To make themselves a clear and apparent danger to the state, in which case they are subject to physical liquidation by the status quo and are self-eliminating in terms of revolutionary potential. In either event - mere ineffectuality or suicide - the objective conditions leading to the necessity for social revolution remain unlikely to be altered by purely pacifist strategies. As these conditions typically include war, the induced starvation of whole populations and the like, pacifism and its attendant sacrifice of life cannot even be rightly said to have substantially impacted the level of evident societal violence. The mass suffering that revolution is intended to alleviate will continue as the revolution strangles itself on the altar of "nonviolence."

### Extensions

### Non-violence Fails

#### It is impossible for a politically oppressed population to use legal means to gain their freedom.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79) CM

In a democracy in which the inherent dignity of every person is fully respected, law and order should indeed be a paramount value. A system that respects law and order maintains a civil society in which individual activity and social behavior conform to legal norms which protects the cultural and economic assets of the community. The benefits that a civil society confers on the people legitimize the need to preserve the legal means through which mutually advantageous laws are made, applied, and enforced. Furthermore, law and order guarantees an orderly resolution of individual and social disputes without disturbing the peace and normal conditions of civil society. Thus, law and order is a normative concept upholding the very existence of a legal system that makes social life possible and allows people to conduct their affairs without fear and uncertainty. Individuals are not likely to challenge law and order if they have a stake in the system. If the system confers rights and benefits upon all without any unjust discrimination, the entire community will consider law and order a necessary precondition for maintaining a civil society. If the system protects life, liberty, and property on a selective basis, however, only those who benefit from the system will respect and demand law and order. For these citizens, law and order is still the essential condition for preserving a civil society. Those who are denied the benefits of the system, however, have a different perspective on the importance of this concept. For them, law and order represents misery, lack of liberty, and defenselessness. For these people, law and order is a coercive force used to keep them down. Thus, law and order acquires two different meanings within the same system - a positive definition for those who profit from its dictates and a negative one for those who suffer under its dicates. For those who suffer, law and order loses its normative force and becomes a tool of oppression. The system may provide some security to the oppressed in terms of protecting their lives, but the chief purpose of law and order is to maintain the oppressor's control over the legal means. Law and order is then reduced to a simple proposition that the oppressed should not break the law which is similar to the premise that a slave should not flee even if the master is cruel. Consequently, the oppressed lose faith in the legal system. They know that they have no control over the legislative means to undo the laws that oppress them. They anticipate that the judges will not or cannot demolish the system of oppression . They understand and fear the awesome power of the enforcement agencies trained to sustain the network of oppression . Such a context of helplessness commands the oppressed not to break the law or disturb the peace of the community. For the oppressed, law and order loses its value precisely because it preserves the system as it is. Furthermore, law and order forecloses non-legal means to change the system. It forbids any resort to armed struggle. It prohibits any conspiracy to overthrow the system. It proscribes any commission of violence against the life, liberty, and property of the holders of authority or members of the ruling class. Consequently, the oppressed are fully trapped. They cannot obtain freedom through legal means over which the oppressor has full control. They cannot change the system through non-legal means because law and order will not let them. Thus, from the viewpoint of the oppressed, law and order is no longer distinguishable from oppression . The two notions become synonymous and a fight against one turns into a fight against the other. Thus, the question becomes what can or should be done by those who are faced with such daunting circumstances. The oppressed may choose to obey the oppressive system, or they may launch a moral crusade in the hope that someday they will overcome and the oppressor will morally mature and change his ways. The oppressor would of course prefer that the oppressed do nothing or embrace a policy of non-violence. Under either of these scenarios the oppressor remains in control of the situation and can lower the degree of oppression when absolutely necessary to accommodate a small change. Suffering and pacifism, however, make the cruelest combination to perpetuate a wrong. This is exactly what the oppressor wants. Thus, a third alternative is that the oppressed fight on the presumption that the oppressor is untrustworthy and will not change voluntarily. Paraphrasing Shakespeare, Malcolm put the dilemma in the words of Hamlet: ""Whether it was nobler in the mind of man to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" - moderation - "or to take up arms against a sea of troubles and by opposing end them."" Malcolm suggests that the oppressed adopt a more militant approach. The concept of by any means necessary unravels the normative pretense of the oppressive system and rejects the moral claims of those who argue that law and order must remain a supreme value even in the most unjust system. When a system refuses to recognize the fundamental rights of a group of citizens, the moral imperative to challenge the oppressor gains momentum and arguments for the maintenance of law and order lose merit. If obedience to the system does not change the condition of subjugation, a new attitude among the subjugated begins to develop. The yearning to break away from oppression illicits a militant and defiant attitude against those who deny even such fundamental rights.

#### Law and order & civil disobedience perpetuate a system of oppression

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcolm X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79) P. 26 - 27

Individuals are not likely to challenge law and order if they have a stake in the system. If the system confers rights and benefits upon all without any unjust discrimination, the entire community will consider law and order a necessary precondition for maintaining a civil society.If the system protects life, liberty, and property on a selective basis, however, only those who benefit from the system will respect and demand law and order.For these citizens, law and order is still the essential condition for preserving a civil society. Those who are denied the benefits of the system,however, have a different perspective on the importance of this concept. For them,law and order represents misery, lack of liberty, and defenselessness. For these people, law and order is a coercive force used to keep them down. Thus, law and order acquires two different meanings within the same system - a positive definition for those who profit from its dictates and a negative one for those who suffer under its dicates. For those who suffer, law and order loses its normative force and becomes a tool of oppression. The system may provide some security to the oppressed in terms of protecting their lives, but the chief purpose of law and order is to maintain the oppressor's control over the legal means.Law and order is then reduced to a simple proposition that the oppressed should not break the law which is similar to the premise that a slave should not flee even if the master is cruel. Consequently, the oppressed lose faith in the legal system.They know that they have no control over the legislative means to undo the laws that oppress them. They anticipate that the judges will not or cannot demolish the system of oppression. They understand and fear the awesome power ofthe enforcement agencies trained to sustain the network of oppression. Such a context of helplessness commands the oppressed not to break the law or disturb the peace of the community. For the oppressed, law and order loses its value precisely because it preserves the system as it is.Furthermore, law and orderforecloses non-legal means to change the system. It forbids any resort to armed struggle. It prohibits any conspiracy to overthrow the system. It proscribes any commission of violence against the life, liberty, and property of the holders of authority or members of the ruling class. Consequently, the oppressed are fully trapped. They cannot obtain freedom through legal means over which the oppressor has full control. They cannot change the system through non-legal means because law and order will not let them. Thus,from the viewpoint of the oppressed,law and order is no longer distinguishable from oppression.The two notions become synonymous and a fight against one turns into a fight against the other. Thus, the question becomes what can or should be done by those who are faced with such daunting circumstances. The oppressed may choose to obey the oppressive system, or they may launch a moral crusade in the hope that someday they will overcome and the oppressor will morally mature and change his ways.The oppressor would of course prefer that the oppressed do nothing or embrace a policy of non-violence. Under either of these scenarios the oppressor remains in control of the situation and can lower the degree of oppression when absolutely necessary to accommodate a small change. Suffering and pacifism, however, make the cruelest combination to perpetuate a wrong. This is exactly what the oppressor wants. Thus, a third alternative is that the oppressed fight on the presumption that the oppressor is untrustworthy and will not change voluntarily.Paraphrasing Shakespeare, Malcolm put the dilemma in the words of Hamlet: "Whether it was nobler in the mind of man to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" - moderation - "or to take up arms against a sea of troubles and by opposing end them." Malcolm suggests that the oppressed adopt a more militant approach. The concept of by any means necessary unravels the normative pretense of the oppressive system and rejects the moral claims of those who argue that law and order must remain a supreme value even in the most unjust system. When a system refuses to recognize the fundamental rights of a group of citizens, the moral imperative to challenge the oppressor gains momentum and arguments for the maintenance of law and order lose merit. If obedience to the system does not change the condition of subjugation, a new attitude among the subjugated begins to develop. The yearning to break away from oppression illicits a militant and defiant attitude against those who deny even such fundamental rights.

#### “Law and Order” is a form of oppression used to force the oppressed into submission.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79) CM

In an oppressive system, any means necessary is an antithesis to legal means. This antithesis steps forward when law and order has become synonymous with oppression . The contrast between the two concepts is vivid. Law and order upholds oppressive laws as they are; any means necessary challenges these laws. Law and order proposes that any change in the system must be effectuated through the legal means; any means necessary argues that when the oppressor controls the legal means, freedom through law is impossible. With respect to the use of force, however, law and order will allow enforcement agencies to use force if necessary against those who defy the laws of occupation, slavery, apartheid, segregation, caste system, and blatant discrimination. Consequently, any means necessary allows the oppressed to use force if necessary against those who institute occupation, slavery, apartheid, segregation, caste systems, and blatant discrimination. Each form of oppression is unique. Therefore, no rigid formula exists defining the scope of any means necessary. The methods for fighting one form of oppression may or may not be useful for fighting another form of oppression . What might work to combat foreign occupation (such as the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan) may not work to dismantle a deeply entrenched caste system (such as the religiously-based difference between Brahmans and the untouchables). Each oppressed group must analyze the nature of their oppression to design appropriate means to reject and erase oppression. Regardless of the form the oppression takes, Malcolm's message is the same: rise up and fight it by any means necessary. Once the oppressed become conscious of their predicament and are empowered to do something about it, they will choose freedom, independence, and self-help. Any means necessary teaches the oppressed to lose respect for the oppressor. They no longer surrender their offspring to oppression in the hope that the oppressor will mature morally; nor do they take a moral high ground to civilize the oppressor at the cost of their own suffering. Active resistance to save honor and human dignity preempts the fear of losing one's life to the grip of oppression .

#### This under-handed oppression, despite not necessarily being recognized by the oppressed, creates a sense of inferiority and self-loathing among its victims.

Khan, Ali 1994. (Ali Khan is a Professor of Law at Washburn University. “Lessons From Malcolm X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary.” Howard Law Journal, vol. 38, Jan. 1994. SSRN, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=938821.).

Such an assault on human dignity has a devastating effect on the oppressed. According to Malcolm, the oppressors begin to control the minds of the oppressed, and the oppressed begin to think about themselves just as the oppressors characterize them. Consequently, the oppressed internalize self-hatred manifested by hating their skin, hating their caste, hating their language, hating their religion, and indeed hating who they are and what they are. This hatred leads the oppressed to turn upon themselves blaming their own kind, and killing their own children, brothers, and sisters, as if it is their own race, their own caste, their own religion, and their own community had trapped them and brought them down. Thus, deep and enduring marks of inferiority and degradation eliminate the dignity of the entire group.

#### Spread of pacifist practice stifles revolutions in America.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 73)[KD]

Such a situation must abort whatever limited utility pacifst tactics might have, absent other and concurrent forms of struggle, as a socially transformative method. Yet the history of the American left over the past decade shows too clearly that the more diluted the substance embodied in “pacifist practice,” the louder the insistence of its subscribers that nonviolence is the only mode of action “appropriate and acceptable within the context of North America,” and the greater the effort to ostracize, or even stifle, divergent types of actions.⁵⁹ Such strategic hegemony exerted by proponents of this truncated range of tactical options has done much to foreclose on whatever revolutionary potential may be said to exist in modern America.

#### Cooperation with the oppressive state reduces protest efficacy by submitting to the state’s ‘rules of the game’

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 83 [KD])

Viewed in this light, a great many things make sense. For instance, the persistent use of the term “responsible leadership” in describing the normative nonviolent sector of North American dissent—always somewhat mysterious when applied to supposed radicals (or German Jews)—is clarifed as signifying nothing substantially diferent from the accommodation of the status quo it implies in more conventional settings.⁹² The “rules of the game” have long been established and tacitly agreed to by both sides of the ostensible “oppositional equation”: demonstrations of “resistance” to state policies will be allowed so long as they do nothing to materially interfere with the implementation of those policies.⁹³ The responsibility of the oppositional leadership in such a trade-of is to ensure that state processes are not threatened by substantial physical disruption; the reciprocal responsibility of the government is to guarantee the general safety of those who play according to the rules.⁹⁴ This comfortable scenario is enhanced by the mutual understanding that certain levels of “appropriate” (symbolic) protest of given policies will result in the “oppositional victory” of their modifcation (i.e., really a “tuning” of policy by which it may be rendered more functional and efficient, never an abandonment of fundamental policy thrusts), while efforts to move beyond this metaphorical medium of dissent will be squelched “by any means necessary” and by all parties concerned.⁹⁵ Meanwhile, the entire unspoken arrangement is larded with a layer of stridently abusive rhetoric directed by each side against the other. We are left with a husk of opposition, a ritual form capable of affording a maudlin “I’m OK, you’re OK” satisfaction to its subscribers at a psychic level but utterly useless pacifism a s pathology in terms of transforming the power relations perpetuating systemic global violence.⁹⁶ Such a defect can, however, be readily sublimated within the aggregate comfort zone produced by the continuation of North American business as usual; those who remain within the parameters of nondisruptive dissent allowed by the state, their symbolic duty to the victims of U.S. policy done (and with the bases of state power wholly unchallenged), can devote themselves to the prefiguration of the revolutionary future society with which they proclaim they will replace the present social order (having, no doubt, persuaded the state to overthrow itself through the moral force of their arguments).⁹⁷ Here, concrete activities such as sexual experimentation, refnement of musical/artistic tastes, development of various meat-free diets, getting in touch with one’s “id” through meditation and ingestion of hallucinogens, alteration of sex-based distribution of household chores, and waging campaigns against such “bourgeois vices” as smoking tobacco become the signifers of “correct politics” or even “revolutionary practice.” This is as opposed to the active and effective confrontation of state power.⁹⁸

#### Predictability of peaceful protest diminishes its success and submits to the status quo.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 102 [KD])

The hegemony of pacifist activity and thought within the late capitalist states, on the other hand, not only bows before the balance of power that rests with the status quo in any head-on contest by force but also gives up the second and third tenets. With activities self-restricted to a relatively narrow band of ritual forms, pacifist tacticians automatically sacrifce much of their (potential) fexibility in confronting the state; within this narrow band, actions become entirely predictable rather than ofering the utility of surprise. The bottom-line balance of physical power thus inevitably rests with the state on an essentially permanent basis, and the possibility of liberal social transformation is correspondingly diminished to a point of nonexistence. The British Special Air Service motto is again borne out, this time via a converse formulation: “Who fails to dare, loses . . . perpetually.”

### Legal Methods Fail

#### Legal means as a source of oppression

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

When the oppressor controls the legal means, law is a direct source of oppression. 57 A legal system may formally embrace princi- [\*92] ples of justice such as the equal protection of laws, due process, and fundamental civil rights and liberties, yet these formal notions of justice, do not assure that oppression against disfavored groups will cease to exist. If legal means remain in the oppressor's hands, particularly one with a historical record for perpetuating oppression, the formal legal system may not tell the whole story of oppression. Hence, in every situation, the critical question will be: who controls the legal means? This simple question may unravel the secrets of oppression

#### Legal positivism allows oppressors to practice complete control over the judiciary making recourse the the courts an non-viable option.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79) KL

To further tighten control over the system, the oppressor may institute a jurisprudence of oppression. Even though judges commit serious mistakes in deciding cases and may render biased, even cruel judgments, there is, nonetheless, a popular yearning for judges to do justice. Against this normative longing for justice, the jurisprudence of oppression creates an alternative theory under which a judge must uphold the law even if the law is unjust. Known as legal positivism, the theory separates law from morals, notions of justice, basic human compassion, and even from common sense fairness. If laws are inherently just, legal positivism might be defensible as a theory that protects the sanctity of law from judicial intervention. If laws are made to institute slavery, segregation, and blatant discrimination, however, any theory that restricts judicial discretion and compels judges to apply these laws as it is assumes an oppressive character. Legal positivism has served well the oppressors in Nazi Germany, South Africa, and the United States. It is important to understand how legal positivism works as a jurisprudence of oppression. When the oppressor gains control of the legislative means, he assumes the authority to make, modify, and repeal laws. To remain in charge of the laws, the oppressor abhors sharing his power with anyone, particularly those individuals who feel that their job is to do justice. Of course, the oppressor may appoint judges who share the ideology of oppression. To strike deeply into the normative role of the judiciary, however, the oppressor must restrain all judges from tinkering with the legal system. Legal positivism does just that. It fortifies the legislative means under the oppressor's command, assuring that judges will enforce the laws as they are.

#### Enforcement agencies provide no recourse for the oppressed and strengthen the oppressor serving no justice for the oppressed.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79) KL

No system of oppression can function unless the oppressor has full control over the enforcement means. It is necessary that the oppressor govern the legislature and the judiciary. For the oppressor to maintain complete control of the legal system, however, control of the enforcement means is indispensable. For the system to work, it is necessary that the enforcement agencies share the ideology of oppression. No overt training in the ideology of oppression is necessary. If enforcement agencies create a culture of law and order and officers are trained to uphold the law without any leniency for the law-breaker, the system of oppression works quite smoothly. In almost every legal system, some gap between law as written and law as enforced is inevitable. In a system of oppression, however, many discriminatory exceptions to the written law operate to deal with the oppressed. In an extreme case, it is quite possible that two distinct (formal) systems exist side by side: one for the oppressor and the other for the oppressed. In any discriminatory system the police will stop, search, or arrest members of the oppressed group more frequently and on a lower standard of suspicion. The police will also coerce them to confess or supply the incriminating evidence. Government prosecutors will be more prone to indict them, charge them with serious crimes, and bargain an uncompromising plea. Juries will be more inclined to convict them. Judges will give them harsher sentences. The oppressed face similarly degrading treatment in prisons. To further support the enforcement of oppressive laws, sociological myths will be created to label the oppressed, such as they have less regard for the law; they are violent by nature; or they pose a threat to public safety. The system of oppression works without any internal threat if members of the oppressed group are excluded from enforcement agencies. Furthermore, the fear of law is more seriously grounded in the psyche of the oppressed when the police, prosecutors, magistrates, and prison officials share the same mentality derived from the ruling class. A total exclusion of the oppressed from the enforcement agencies, however, is not absolutely necessary to operate a system of oppression. The members of the oppressed group may be recruited in the lower ranks, vesting them with some visibility but little or no authority. Even when recruited for more influential jobs in enforcement agencies, members of the oppressed group will be trained in the psychology of law and order, which would effectively seal them from any improper compassion for their own group. Given the institutional role of enforcement agencies, which is to enforce laws as they are without evaluating their intrinsic justness, officers recruited from the oppressed group begin to identify more with their jobs than with their condition of oppression. Ultimately the oppressor will do anything possible to remain in charge of enforcement policy and its execution.

#### Pacifism fails to acknowledge logical contradictions and hides behind basic principles.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 95 [KD])

A number of logical contradictions and fundamental misunderstandings of political reality present themselves within the doctrinal corpus of American pacifst premises and practices (both as concerns real pacifsm and relative to the modern American “comfort zone” variety). Matters of this sort are usually remediable, at least to a signifcant extent, through processes of philosophical/political dialogue, factual correction, and the like.¹³⁵ Subscribers to the notion of pacifsm, however, have proven themselves so resistant as to be immune to conventional critique and suasion, hunkering down instead behind a wall of “principles,” especially when these can be demonstrated to be lacking both logically and practically in terms of validity, viability, and utility.¹³⁶ The “blind faith” obstinacy inherent in this position is thus not immediately open to pragmatic, or even empirical, consideration. It might be more properly categorized within the sphere of theological inquiry (particularly as regards the fundamentalist and occult religious doctrines)—and, indeed, many variants of pacifst dogma acknowledge strong links to an array of sects and denominations—were it not that pacifsm asserts itself (generically) not only as a functional aspect of “the real world,” but as a praxis capable of engendering revolutionary social transformation.¹³⁷ Its basic irrationalities must therefore be taken, on their face, as seriously intended to supplant reality itself.

#### Nonviolent protesters are self-interested sell-outs

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 87-88 [KD])

The nonviolent mass antiwar movement’s solidarity with the Vietnamese undercut the political ability of the U.S. government to continue and forced the war to an early close (a stated objective of the movement of the late 1960s). This claim is obviously closely akin to the contention concerning Johnson, although it should be recalled that even U.S. ground forces remained in Vietnam for another four years afer that “victory.” Actually, there was no mass antiwar movement in the United States, nonviolent or otherwise, by the time the war ended in 1975. It had begun to dissipate rapidly during the summer of 1970 in the wake of sustaining its first and only real casualties—a total of four dead at Kent State University in Ohio that spring.¹⁰⁹ By the time the last U.S. ground troops were withdrawn in March 1973, “Nixinger” had suspended the draft, and with the element of their personal jeopardy thus eliminated, the “principled” opposition fueling the mass movement evaporated altogether while the war did not.¹¹⁰ That the war continued for another two years with U.S. technological and economic support at the cost of hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese lives but absent even a symbolic mass American opposition worthy of the name says volumes about the nature of the nonviolent movement’s “solidarity with the Vietnamese.”¹¹¹ And, as always, it was the armed pacifism a s pathology struggle waged by the Vietnamese themselves—without the pretense of systematic support from the American pacifists— which finally forced the war to a close.¹¹²

#### When law carries out the will of the oppressor, law perpetuates an unjust and cruel society

Kahn 1994 (WAli [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79 sb)

I discovered, not to my great surprise, that Malcolm was not a legal positivist. Malcolm recognized that when law carries out the will of the oppressor, law perpetuates an unjust and cruel society. I also discovered, however, that Malcolm was not a cynic who, in a sustained fit of disenchantment, proposed complete disregard for systemic responsibility.

#### Forcing action via legal systems by the oppressed

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

By any means necessary is a defiant phrase that threatens the establishment, opposes the notion of law and order, and exposes the failure of the legal system to provide justice. It empowers the oppressed by sowing seeds of militancy, forcing them to reflect upon their condition of oppression and than daring to change the system. By any means necessary is also an intimidating utterance that fright- [\*84] ens many citizens, instituting a state of terror in which their life, liberty, and property seem no longer secure. Taken in its total effect, Malcolm's phrase offers a complex mix of defiance, fearlessness, and militancy with insurgence, fright and anarchy.

#### Legislative means to alleviating Oppression

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

The first means to alleviate oppression is legislation. At the local, state, and federal levels, people lobby for needed legislation through their elected representatives. A constitutional amendment, transforming a fundamental norm of social structure, is a form of "super-legislation" brought about by a collaborative effort of the peoples' representatives at the state and federal level. 66 It is the highest means of social change which establishes a uniform norm for the entire nation, invalidating any contrary local or state legislation. 67 For exam- [\*97] ple, the Thirteenth Amendment, enacted in 1865, outlawed the existence of slavery and involuntary servitude except as a punishment for crime. 68 This amendment invalidated, automatically, any federal, state, or local statute that allowed slavery. 69

### A2: Specific Examples of Non-Violence

#### Gandhi’s nonviolent revolution relied on violence for its success.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 58-139)

While other examples are less crystalline in their implications, they are instructive. The vaunted career of Gandhi exhibits characteristics of a calculated strategy of nonviolence salvaged only by the existence of violent peripheral processes.38 While it is true that the great Indian leader never deviated from his stance of passive resistance to British colonization, and that in the end England found it cost-prohibitive to continue its effort to assert control in the face of his opposition, it is equally true that the Gandhian success must be viewed in the context of a general decline in British power brought about by two world wars within a thirty-year period.39 Prior to the decimation of British troop strength and the virtual bankruptcy of the Imperial treasury during World War II, Gandhi's movement showed little likelihood of forcing England's abandonment of India. Without the global violence that destroyed the Empire's ability to forcibly control its colonial territories (and passive populations), India might have continued indefinitely in the pattern of minority rule marking the majority of South Africa's modern history, the first locale in which the Gandhian recipe for liberation struck the reef of reality.40 Hence, while the Mahatma and his followers were able to remain "pure," their victory was contingent upon others physically gutting their opponents for them.

#### MLK’s nonviolent revolution relied on violence to achieve success.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 58-139)

Similarly, the limited success attained by Martin Luther King and his disciples in the United States during the 1960s, using a strategy consciously guided by Gandhian principles of nonviolence, owes a considerable debt to the existence of less pacifist circumstances. King's movement had attracted considerable celebrity, but precious little in the way of tangible political gains prior to the emergence of a trend signaled in 1967 by the redesignation of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC; more or less the campus arm of King's Civil Rights Movement) as the Student National Coordinating Committee.41 The SNCC's action (precipitated by non-pacifists such as Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown) occurred in the context of armed self-defense tactics being employed for the first time by rural black leaders such as Robert Williams, and the eruption of black urban enclaves in Detroit, Newark, Watts, Harlem, and elsewhere. It also coincided with the increasing need of the American state for internal stability due to the unexpectedly intense and effective armed resistance mounted by the Vietnamese against U.S. aggression in Southeast Asia.42 Suddenly King, previously stonewalled and redbaited by the establishment, his roster of civil rights demands evaded or dismissed as being "too radical" and "premature," found himself viewed as the lesser of evils by the state.43 He was duly anointed the "responsible black leader" in the media, and his cherished civil rights agenda was largely incorporated into law during 1968 (along with appropriate riders designed to neutralize "Black Power Militants" such as Carmichael, Brown, and Williams.)44 Without the spectre, real or perceived, of a violent black revolution at large in America during a time of war, King's nonviolent strategy was basically impotent in concrete terms. As one of his Northern organizers, William Jackson, put it to me in 1969: There are a lot of reasons why I can't get behind fomenting violent actions like riots, and none of 'em are religious. It's all pragmatic politics. But I'll tell you what: I never let a riot slide by. I'm always the first one down at city hall and testifying before Congress, tellin' 'em, "See? If you guys'd been dealing with us all along, this never would have happened." It gets results, man. Like nothin' else, y'know? The thing is that Rap Brown and the Black Panthers are just about the best things that ever happened to the Civil Rights Movement. Jackson's exceedingly honest, if more than passingly cynical, outlook was tacitly shared by King.45 The essential contradiction inherent to pacifist praxis is that, for survival itself, any nonviolent confrontation of state power must ultimately depend either on the state refraining from unleashing some real measure of its potential violence, or the active presence of some counterbalancing violence of precisely the sort pacifism professes to reject as a political option.

### Violence Key to Success

#### Violence is not the only response to oppression but essential to successful revolution

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 104 [KD])

By this, it is not being suggested that nonviolent forms of struggle are or should be abandoned, nor that armed struggle should be the normative standard of revolutionary performance, either practically or conceptually. Rather, it is to follow the line of thinking recently articulated by Kwame Ture (Stokely Carmichael) when he noted: “If we are to consider ourselves as revolutionaries, we must acknowledge that we have an obligation to succeed in pursuing revolution. Here, we must acknowledge not only the power of our enemies, but our own power as well. Realizing the nature of our power, we must not deny ourselves the exercise of the options available to us; we must utilize surprise, cunning, and fexibility; we must use the strength of our enemy to undo him, keeping him confused and of-balance. We must organize with perfect clarity to be utterly unpredictable. When our enemies expect us to respond to provocation with violence, we must react calmly and peacefully; just as they anticipate our passivity, we must throw a grenade.”¹⁷²

#### Violence used in a revolutionary manner results in autonomy for the oppressed.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcolm X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79) P. 29 [MF]

In the struggle for freedom, any means necessary sets up several distinct goals. First, the oppressed must cleanse their minds of all vestiges of oppression.This self-cleansing erases the interior effects of oppression, liberates the soul, and emphasizes honor and identity. Second, they must reject all forms of dependence on the oppressor.This notion of self-help mandates that the oppressed do their best to protect and advance their communities. Third, the oppressed must be willing to use force to preserve their human dignity. Once these strategies are implemented, the oppressors will be forced to change the policies that result in subjugation; otherwise, the oppressed will use force to seek their freedom. Thus, any means necessary places an onerous burden on both the oppressed and the oppressors to change the system. In pursuing these goals, the oppressed undergo a profound psychological transformation, and instead of begging favor from the oppressor, they demand justice. They acquire a new sense of identity; and a new sense of dignity; and a new sense of urgency. These traits support self-cleansing, self-help, and self-defense. More importantly, they demand that the oppressed accept responsibility for their oppression and require them to do something to change their situation.

#### Political Oppression results in locking the oppressed out of the legal system, making violence their only recourse.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcolm X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79)

When the oppressor controls the legal means, law is a direct source of oppression. 57 A legal system may formally embrace principles of justice such as the equal protection of laws, due process, and fundamental civil rights and liberties, yet these formal notions of justice, do not assure that oppression against disfavored groups will cease to exist. If legal means remain in the oppressor's hands, particularly one with a historical record for perpetuating oppression, the formal legal system may not tell the whole story of oppression. Hence, in every situation, the critical question will be: who controls the legal means? This simple question may unravel the secrets of oppression. Most systems of government have three branches all of which are involved in the lawmaking process to some extent. These branches comprise the legal means. If the oppressor is in charge of the legislature, the judiciary, and the enforcement agencies, the oppressor has absolute control over the legal means. 58 In other words, any legal challenge to oppression can be preempted since the oppressor is the one who makes the law when the law is needed, interprets the law when the law is challenged, and enforces the law when the law is breached. From the viewpoint of the oppressed, the state of oppression is complete when the oppressed have no access to the legislature, no influence with the judiciary, and no bond with the enforcement agencies. For example, in South Africa, the white minority opposed the inclusion of the majority into the legal system because the white minority feared that it would lose control over the legal means by which apartheid was created and maintained. Likewise, years ago when the slave owner's control over the legal means to maintain slavery was challenged in the United States, the slave-owners took up arms to resist change. I do not maintain that anyone who controls the legal means is an oppressor. Nor do I assert that social, political, and economic means of oppression are secondary in nature or effect. I simply suggest that oppression is more effectively carried out when the oppressor gains exclusive authority over the legal means. There are many reasons for the establishment to perpetuate oppressive policies, ranging from moral failure to irrational prejudice. The methods by which the oppressor implements oppression also are varied ranging from slavery, to caste systems, and then to socioeconomic discrimination. In order for state-sponsored oppression to exist, however, the oppressor must gain control over the legal means. Once the oppressor has the legislative, judicial, and enforcement means at his disposal, the economic, social, and political means of oppression can be easily harnessed.

The voice of the oppressed is silenced in the legislative body, making any legislative change not viable.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79)

In this complicated legal structure, however, an oppressed group is vulnerable at all levels. It is axiomatic that each piece of legislation enacted at any level is a political product. A statute comes into existence only when supportive political forces have a majority in the legislature. A legislative social change is in essence a political change brought about by politicians whose mixed motives are not simply driven by the will to do good. Since political considerations rather than concerns for justice may dominate the domain of legislation, politically weak groups may lose at any tier of the legislative hierarchy. The mere presence of more than one legislative means to initiate social change does not mean necessarily that the oppressed group has more than one alternative. If the political establishment is determined to resist change, each legislative level acts as a distinct impediment. Total subjugation is not the only way to prevent the oppressed from having access to the legal means. Lesser legal strategies might be practiced to achieve a similar purpose. The right to vote is an effective democratic tool to influence the legislative means by which laws are passed and repealed. By denying the oppressed the right to vote, the oppressor continues to remain in charge of the legislative means. Even when the right to vote grudgingly is granted to the oppressed, the oppressor may design new legal devices to maintain complete control of the legislative means. The oppressor may gerrymander the districts to abridge or dilute the collective voting power of the oppressed. When the oppressed are poor, the oppressor may require the payment of a poll tax before casting a vote. When the oppressed are uneducated, the oppressor may require the passing of a literacy test to limit the franchise. Whatever reasons the oppressor might give to justify restrictions on voting rights of the oppressed, the underlying mischief is to deny the oppressed, as much as possible, meaningful access to the legislative means. Even when formal restrictions on the right to vote are removed, the oppressor will refuse to vote for the candidates of the oppressed. The reason is simple. If the oppressed gain the legislative power to make and repeal laws, then oppression will cease to exist. This is an outcome that the oppressor does not desire.

#### Protests, by gaining legal permission to assemble, do nothing to undermine the state

Churchill 2017 [KD] (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 74)

Throughout the whole charade it will be noticed that the state is represented by a uniformed police presence keeping a discreet distance and not interfering with the activities. And why should they? The organizers of the demonstration will have gone through “proper channels” to obtain permits required by the state and instructions as to where they will be allowed to assemble, how long they will be allowed to stay and, should a march be involved in the demonstration, along which routes they will be allowed to walk. Surrounding the larger mass of demonstrators can be seen others—an elite. Adorned with green (or white or powder blue) armbands, their function is to ensure that demonstrators remain “responsible,” not deviating from the state-sanctioned plan of protest. Individuals or small groups who attempt to spin of from the main body, entering areas to which the state has denied access (or some other unapproved activity) are headed of by these armbanded “marshals” who argue—pointing to the nearby police—that “troublemaking” will only “exacerbate an already tense situation” and “provoke violence,” thereby “alienating those we are attempting to reach.”⁶⁰ In some ways, the voice of the “good Jews” can be heard to echo plainly over the years.

#### Guerilla Strategies allow violent revolutionaries to overcome state military strength.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 102 [KD])

The frst tenet is, to be sure, a hopeless proposition at the outset of virtually any revolutionary struggle. The “big battalions”—and balance of physical power—inevitably rest with the state’s police, paramilitary, and military apparatus, at least through the initial and intermediate stages of the liberatory process. Consequently, Third World revolutionary tacticians have compensated by emphasizing tenets two and three (surprise and fexibility), developing the art of guerrilla warfare to a very high degree.¹⁶⁵ Within the more industrialized contexts of Europe and North America, this has assumed forms typically referred to as “terrorism.”¹⁶⁶ In either event, the method has proven increasingly successful in befuddling more orthodox military thinking throughout the twentieth century, has led to a familiar series of fallen dictators and dismantled colonial regimes, and has substantially borne out the thrust of the “dare to struggle, dare to win” axiom.¹⁶⁷

#### Although contradictory, violent responses to oppression are the only way to peace

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 114 [KD])

In concluding, I would at last like to state the essential premise of this essay clearly: the desire for a nonviolent and cooperative world is the healthiest of all psychological manifestations. This is the overarching principle of liberation and revolution.¹⁷⁸ Undoubtedly, it seems the highest order of contradiction that, in order to achieve nonviolence, we must first break with it in overcoming its root causes. Therein, however, lies our only hope.

#### Freedom by any means necessary is less frightening than nonviolence.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

It is no secret that Malcolm's doctrine of freedom by any means necessary generates fear. It advocates the use of force in an attempt to gain social justice which poses a threat to law and order of the society. This concept is particularly disturbing to those who control the means of change. This idea, however, is also disturbing to those who prefer non-violence even when they are subjected to injustice, those who have resigned themselves to failure, 6 and to those who have been filled with fear "ever since they were babies." 7

#### Oppressed peoples can ensure dignity without causing harm upon themselves.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

There is a spiritual layer of Malcolm's message as well which goes beyond restoring the material welfare of oppressed communities. It is a message that instills human dignity which oppressors have systematically besieged through a spiritually deficient legal system. It restores the confidence of a people who have been invaded, colonized, enslaved, segregated, and made inferior by force, manipulation, fraud, and miseducation. 15 Malcolm emphasizes the restoration of human dignity - the birthright of every man and woman without any distinction as to race, color, language, religion, political opinion, social origin, property, birth, or any other status. To assert their human dignity, Malcolm argues, the oppressed need not leave their own communities, nor need they be timid, overly-friendly, or apologetic in [\*] their dealings with the oppressor. Some distance from the oppressor is good for the soul, and perhaps necessary for maintaining a spiritual balance.

### Historical Examples

#### Despite claims of peacefulness and non-violence, it took violence for women to gain the right to vote.

Oliver, 2017 Mark. [Writer, Teacher, Father] “These Fearless Suffragettes Won The Vote With Hammers And Fire, Not Signs And Chants.” All That's Interesting, All That's Interesting, 25 May 2017, allthatsinteresting.com/militant-suffragettes.

Women didn’t win the vote by holding up signs and waiting for men to give them permission. They took the fight to the streets – and, though history usually brushes over the dirty details, it was sometimes violent. Some of the more militant suffragettes smashed windows, set buildings on fire, and once even tried to assassinate Britain's Prime Minister. These women largely came from the Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU), one of the leading organizations advocating for women's suffrage in the United Kingdom in the early 1900s. For decades beforehand, women had generally tried to win their rights peacefully, but in 1903, that changed. That year, Emmeline Pankhurst formed the Women’s Social Political Union under the motto "deeds, not words.” At first, most of the suffragettes’ “deeds” consisted of holding rallies and heckling politicians. Only a few were truly militant – like Mary Leigh, who started smashing store windows as a form of protest. Leigh ended up in prison after one particular vicious day. She hurled an ax at Prime Minister Herbert Asquith, missing his head but wounding another man in his carriage. Leigh fled before they could find her, but was caught later in the day trying to burn a theater to the ground. The suffragettes went guerilla in 1910, after a day that went down in history as “Black Friday”. When [Prime minister] Asquith delayed passing the Conciliation Bill, which would have given property-owning women the right to vote, a group of 300 women tried to storm the House of Commons in protest. The police became violent, brutally beating the women and arresting 119 people. From that day on, the suffragettes became increasingly violent. They took up Mary Leigh’s window-smashing campaign, walking through the streets with hammers and breaking every shop window they saw. They burned buildings to the ground, usually targeting the homes of politicians or clubs that only allowed men. Until they got the right to vote, they would make life for men hell. Hundreds of women were arrested. In prison, many went on hunger strikes. Prison guards started force-feeding them to keep them alive, often having to jam tubes painfully up their noses to do it. Eventually, authorities passed the “Cat and Mouse Act,” a law that allowed them to set hunger-striking suffragettes free and arrest them the second they’d eaten a morsel of food. Ultimately, World War I brought an end to the violence. The suffragettes called for a peace treaty during the war and, shortly after, women won the right to vote. Time passed, and the memory of those militant days started to fade. Today, most of the stories we hear and photos we see of their movement are of women holding signs or handing out petitions – but it took much more than that to win the right to vote. It took a revolution – with hammers, axes, and fire.”

#### Stonewall, a violent protest, was the spark of contemporary Gay Pride.

Worthen, 2017 (Meredith [Associate Professor of Sociology at University of Oklahoma] “Stonewall: The People, The Place, and the Lasting Signifigence of ‘Where Pride Began’.” June 2017. Biography.com Accessed 7/24/2018. https://www.biography.com/news/stonewall-riots-history-leaders)

The hub of the NYC Gay Community in the 1960s was undeniably The Stonewall Inn. Located in Greenwich Village at 51 and 53 Christopher Street, this gay bar and dance club was enclosed within thick stone walls—remnants from its history as horse stables that provided both its namesake and a protective barrier from the outside world that was on the whole, unsupportive of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people. Generally thought of as a “safe place” for the LGBT community, plainclothes police officers invaded The Stonewall Inn on Friday, June 27, 1969 (the same day as the nearby Manhattan funeral of gay icon entertainer/actress/singer Judy Garland) and just after 3 a.m. on June 28, things turned violent after a few LGBT people were arrested on questionable charges, handcuffed, and very publicly forced into police cars on the streets of NYC. The LGBT community was fed up with being targeted by the police and seeing these public arrests incited rioting that spilled over into the neighboring streets and lasted several days. These events have been collectively described as a “riot,” a “rebellion,” a “protest,” and an “uprising.” Whatever the label, this was certainly a watershed moment in LGBT history. In fact many believe that the events at Stonewall sparked the modern LGBT rights movement in the United States. The people who were at The Stonewall Inn and/or participated in the events at Stonewall in late June/early July 1969 are known as “Stonewallers.” Although it is unknown exactly how many Stonewallers there are, some project hundreds of thousands, many have publicly shared their stories and some are members of the Stonewall Veterans' Association (SVA). These include: Virginia Apuzzo, Martin Boyce, Raymond Castro, Danny Garvin, William Henderson, Jerry Hoose, Marsha P. Johnson, Carl J. Keller, Jr., Tommy Lanigan-Schmidt, Dick Leitsch, Leigh McManus, Daria Modon, John O'Brien, Electra O'Mara, Yvonne Ritter, Sylvia Rivera, Craig Rodwell, Fred Sargeant, Martha Shelley, Howard Smith, Lucian Truscott, Terri Van Dyke, Dave West, and Doric Wilson, to name a few. Revolutionary trans activist Marsha P. Johnson is the subject of The Death and Life of Marsha P. Johnson, which premiered at the Tribeca Film Festival and was acquired by Netflix. (Photo: Courtesy Tribeca Film Festival) Marsha “Pay it no mind” Johnson was at The Stonewall Inn on the first night of the riots. Many eyewitnesses have identified her as one of the main instigators of the uprising. Born Malcolm Michaels, Jr. on August 24, 1945 in Elizabeth, New Jersey, Marsha P. Johnson moved to NYC in the mid-1960s. She faced many hardships as an African American trans woman and even lived on the streets until she broke into the nightclub scene and became a prominent NYC drag queen. An eccentric woman known for her outlandish hats and glamorous jewelry, she was fearless and bold. Whenever she was asked what the “P” in her name stood for and when people pried about her gender or sexuality, she quipped back with “Pay it No Mind.” Her forthright nature and enduring strength led her to speak out against the injustices she saw at Stonewall in 1969. Following the events at Stonewall, Johnson and her friend Sylvia Rivera co-founded the Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries (STAR) and they became fixtures in the community, especially in their commitment to helping homeless transgender youth in NYC. Sadly, at the age of 46, on July 6, 1992, her body was found floating in the Hudson River off the West Village Piers. The police initially ruled her death a suicide despite claims from her friends and other members of the local community that she was not suicidal. Twenty-five years later, crime victim advocate Victoria Cruz of the New York City Anti-Violence Project (AVP) re-opened this investigation. Johnson’s story is featured in Pay It No Mind: Marsha P. Johnson (2012) and The Death and Life of Marsha P. Johnson (2017). She is honored as a Stonewall instigator, an Andy Warhol model, a drag queen, a saint, and a revolutionary trans activist. On the first anniversary of the Stonewall rebellion in June 1970, the very first gay pride march was held in Manhattan and since then, millions of LGBT pride marches, parades, picnics, parties, festivals, and symposia have taken place and June has been declared LGBT Pride Month to honor the 1969 Stonewall riots. Although the original Stonewall Club closed its doors in December 1969, the totally renovated Stonewall Inn reopened on March 12, 2007 at 53 Christopher Street. On June 24, 2016, the Stonewall Inn was officially recognized as a National Historic Landmark by President Barack Obama due to its association with events that outstandingly represent the struggle for civil rights in America. The Stonewall Inn is the very first LGBT National Historic Landmark in history. New York Mayor Bill DeBlasio (back row), Congressman Jerrold Nadler (front row, left) and Valerie Jarrett (front row, right), Senior Advisor to President Barack Obama, at the dedication ceremony officially designating the Stonewall Inn as a national monument on June 27, 2016. (Photo: Spencer Platt/Getty Images) The Stonewall riots were a tipping point for the Gay Liberation Movement in the United States. Its participants shaped a new cultural awareness of a population that was largely ostracized. Along with Marsha P. Johnson who played a pivotal role in the initial moment of resistance that sparked the landmark rebellion, millions of activists continue to commemorate the events at Stonewall and fight for LGBT rights. Numerous plays, musicals, books, and films celebrate and honor the history of Stonewall and anyone can drop by The Stonewall Inn to see “where pride began.”

#### The history of violent revolutions is often forgotten.

Rasmussen ‘11 (Daniel Rasmussen is the author American Uprising: The Untold Story of America’s Largest Slave Revolt., https://www.thedailybeast.com/new-orleans-forgotten-slave-revolt-by-dan-rasmussen-american-uprising-author)

Two hundred years ago this past Saturday, three slaves gathered in a small rundown cabin on a plantation about 30 miles upriver from New Orleans. Charles Deslondes was the son of an enslaved woman and a French planter; Harry Kenner an unassuming 25-year-old carpenter; and Quamana a warrior captured in the militant Asante kingdom and imported to Louisiana. On January 8, 1811, these three brave men, along with eight other slave leaders, launched the largest slave revolt in American history, rallying an army of nearly 500 slaves to fight and die for freedom. No slave revolt—not Nat Turner, not John Brown—has rivaled the 1811 New Orleans revolt in terms of the number of participants or the number of slaves slaughtered in the aftermath. The revolt was meticulously planned, politically sophisticated, and ethnically diverse—and a fundamental challenge to the system of plantation slavery. Dressed in military uniforms and chanting “On to New Orleans,” they rallied a rugged army of around 500 slaves to attempt to conquer the city, kill all its white inhabitants, and establish a black republic on the shores of the Mississippi. In a dramatic battle in the cane fields, the slave army faced off against the twin forces of the American military and a hastily assembled planter militia. “The blacks were not intimidated by this army and formed themselves in line and fired for as long as they had ammunition,” wrote one observer. But the slaves’ ammunition did not last long, and the battle was brief. Soon the planter militia broke the slave line and the slaughter began. The planters, supported by the U.S. military, captured Charles Deslondes, chopped off his hands, broke his thighs, and then roasted him on a pile of straw. Over the next few days, they executed and beheaded more than 100 slaves, putting their heads on poles and dangling their dismembered corpses from the gates of New Orleans. “Their Heads, which decorate our Levee, all the way up the coast… look like crows sitting on long poles,” wrote one traveler. The rotting corpses were grim reminders of who owned who—and just where true power resided. The American officials and French planters then sought to cover up the true story of the revolt, to dismiss the bold actions of the slave army as irrelevant and trivial, and write this massive uprising out of the record books. They succeeded. And, in doing so, they laid the groundwork for one of the most remarkable moments of historical amnesia in our national memory. The revolutionaries of 1811 were heroes who deserve a place in our national memory. Their actions are a testament to the strength of the ideals of freedom and equality—and every man’s equal claim to those basic rights. Their acts are an inspiration to all people who strive for freedom. On the 200th anniversary of the start of this great revolt, we must listen to their voices and study their stories, for only through understanding the passions and beliefs that resonated through the slave quarters can we begin to comprehend the true history of Louisiana, and with it, the nation.

### Structural Violence

#### Some dominant members oppress by negligence of suffering

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

All members of the dominant group may or may not directly participate in the enterprise of oppression. In most cases, however, the prejudice against the oppressed runs through the entire group. Even those members of the dominant group who morally reject oppression often do nothing beyond verbal condemnation. Their moral inaction to fight injustice has complex motives. They do nothing because their lives are bound to the dominant group in ways they cannot sever. Some are unwilling to give up the social, political, and economic benefits they draw from the prevailing system.

#### Enforcement and oppressing

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79)

No system of oppression can function unless the oppressor has full control over the enforcement means. It is necessary that the oppressor govern the legislature and the judiciary. For the oppressor to maintain complete control of the legal system, however, control of the enforcement means is indispensable. For the system to work, it is necessary that the enforcement agencies share the ideology of oppression. No overt training in the ideology of oppression is necessary. If en- [\*] forcement agencies create a culture of law and order and officers are trained to uphold the law without any leniency for the law-breaker, the system of oppression works quite smoothly.

#### Oppression can be institutionalized in the judicial and enforcement branches

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

To understand oppression, one must not confuse the distinction between what law does and what law should do. What law should do is wishful thinking that may or may not be actualized. What law does is reality as it exists. 63 In an unjust society, oppression is often perpetrated and institutionalized through the use of legal means at the legislative, judicial, and enforcement levels. The prevailing injustice cannot be separated from what law does. This alliance between oppression and the legal means provides a legal framework to institute even the most extreme forms of subjugation such as slavery in the United States and apartheid in South Africa.

#### Judiciary means of oppression through the constitution

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

Although a constitutional amendment is the most effective means to make a durable social change, it is also the most difficult to procure. Combining political forces at the state and federal level to obtain the required majority needed for a constitutional amendment is possible only if the nation as a whole is already prepared to change. 70 In many ways, therefore, a constitutional change occurs only after a substantial reformation has taken place in society. Rarely does a constitutional means of change rescue the oppressed when the majority of the electorate has a vested interest in continuing the status quo or when it is unsympathetic to the condition of the oppressed. Thus, a constitutional change, when most needed, may not be available. As compared to a constitutional amendment, a federal statute is easier to process, requiring a lesser political consensus. 71 Federal statutes can also effect a national social change. 72 In the past few decades, important federal legislation has been passed in the United States to remove unacceptable encumbrances on the right to political participation in the affairs of the state, to discourage employment discrimination on the basis of race and color, and to strengthen civil and political liberties of the disadvantaged groups. Yet, even federal legislation as a means of change does not always work to the advantage of politically weak groups. In addition to prejudice and lack of sympathy that national representatives might have against an oppressed group, the process of legislating is dependent upon wealthy and politically influential interest groups. Due to the excessive cost of getting elected, the lawmakers pay special attention to campaign contributors who may have no interest in fighting injustice in the society. Consequently, oppression will continue to exist if [\*98] the oppressed group lacks the resources to "purchase" a piece of national legislation. 7

#### Right denial oppression

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79)

Total subjugation is not the only way to prevent the oppressed from having access to the legal means. Lesser legal strategies might be practiced to achieve a similar purpose. The right to vote is an effective democratic tool to influence the legislative means by which laws are passed and repealed. 79 By denying the oppressed the right to vote, the oppressor continues to remain in charge of the legislative means. 80 Even when the right to vote grudgingly is granted to the oppressed, the oppressor may design new legal devices to maintain complete control of the legislative means. The oppressor may gerrymander the districts to abridge or dilute the collective voting power of the oppressed. 81 When the oppressed are poor, the oppressor may require the payment of a poll tax before casting a vote. 82 When the oppressed are uneducated, the oppressor may require the passing of a literacy test to limit the franchise. 83

#### Desegregation is not the end of oppression

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79)

Many in the dominant group viewed desegregation as the end of oppression. Most among the oppressed considered it no more than just a beginning. Integration per se did not solve the real questions of oppression. 92 Many decades after the judicial dismantling of racial separateness, de facto segregation of races still exists, and the condition of oppression for many in the ghettos has not changed. 93 Nonetheless, judicial decisions such as Brown and Loving have at least altered the legal landscape of American society, opening up the theoretical possibility of racial intermingling, marriage, and a voluntary fusion of the races. 94 One need only read the opinions rendered in cases such as Plessy v. Ferguson 95 and Dred Scott v. Sandford 96 to understand the extent of hateful racism which the judges of the Court have openly expressed. After reading such cases, one cannot assume that the judicial means in an unjust society will safeguard the victims of oppression.

#### To maintain an oppressive legal system, the oppressed must be blocked from joining the legal profession

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79)

To maintain an oppressive legal system, the oppressed must be blocked from joining the legal profession. If the oppressed have no access to legal education, they will neither understand how the legal system works nor become attorneys and judges. Accordingly, many methods are used to make it difficult for the oppressed to obtain legal education. The law schools may flatly refuse to open their doors to the oppressed. They will adopt admission standards that the oppressed cannot meet. 102 They will require high tuition fees that the oppressed cannot pay. 103 Even when admitted, the oppressed will find that the law school culture is unfriendly and not conducive to receiving a good legal education. 104 Even when the oppressed successfully go through the ordeal of obtaining a legal education, the system may still bar them from having any control. 105 They will not be hired in influential law firms, 106 in key jobs in the government, or in the judiciary. They often fail to establish their own law practices because they are unable to attract clientele who can afford legal services. 107 Thus, the oppressed - even when admitted to the legal profession - will remain on the periphery, away from the center of power, and with no control over the means of change. 108

### Morality

#### There is a moral right to revolution as a response to political oppression.

Williams, 1997. (David. C. [Professor of Law at Indiana University] “The Constitutional Right to ‘Conservative’ Revolution.” Indiana University Law Library. https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1677&context=facpub)

The American political tradition has generally recognized that the people have a moral right to revolution: when a government becomes tyrannical, the citizenry may, by force of arms, overthrow it and institute a new, more acceptable one. The constitutional status of this right is, however, the subject of considerable doubt. It is commonly argued that the moral right to revolution cannot be a constitutional right because the concepts of revolution and constitution are, at a deep level, in conflict. A revolution, by definition, attempts to change the fundamental political order.

#### The morality of politics necessitates violent action.

Howes, Dustin (June 2013), Perspectives on Politics, Vol. 11, No. 2 pp. 427-446 Published by: American Political Science Association

Before an audience of liberal German students, in the midst of German Revolution and in the wake of Germany's defeat in World War I, Max Weber gave his influential lecture "Politics as a Vocation." Drawing upon Machiavelli, his by-now widely recognized work on modern bureaucratic states, and his extensive knowledge of Hindu, Muslim, and Christian religious traditions, Weber argued that the "decisive means for politics is violence." 1 Against the prominent German pacifist and Great War opponent F. W. Förster, he claimed: "[It] is not true that good can follow only from good and evil only from evil, but that often the opposite is true. Anyone who fails to see this is, indeed, a political infant."2 Politics, said Weber, is a field apart, where taking responsibility for the results of ones actions means using methods that would not be legitimate in other realms of life. Moreover, anyone interested in saving their soul "should not seek it along the avenue of politics, for the quite different tasks of politics can only be solved by violence."3 According to Weber, all of the major religious traditions made room for a separate ethic for politics. For instance, Christ's "absolute ethic" of turning the other cheek was not applicable to politics, because "for the politician the reverse proposition holds, 'thou shalt resist evil by force.'"4 Weber's lecture brings to the fore a leitmotif that is ubiquitous in modern political thought. Theorists from John Locke to Karl Marx and Friedrich Hayek to Jean- Paul Sartre all affirm the basic proposition that bad means sometimes lead to good ends and that physical violence is therefore a necessary means for politics.

#### Pacifists value non-violence to protect themselves, not to reduce oppression.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 82 [KD])

Precisely. The preoccupation with avoiding actions that might “provoke violence” is thus not based on a sincere belief that violence will, or even can, truly be avoided. Pacifsts, no less than their nonpacifst counterparts, are quite aware that violence already exists as an integral component in the execution of state policies and requires no provocation; this is a formative basis of their doctrine. What is at issue then cannot be a valid attempt to stave of or even minimize violence per se. Instead, it can only be a conscious efort not to refocus state violence in such a way that it would directly impact American pacifsts themselves. This is true even when it can be shown that the tactics which could trigger such a refocusing might in themselves alleviate a real measure of the much more massive state-inflicted violence occurring elsewhere; better that another 100,000 Indochinese peasants perish under a hail of cluster bombs and napalm than America’s principled progressives sufer real physical pain while rendering their government’s actions impracticable.⁸⁹ Such conscientious avoidance of personal sacrifce (i.e., dodging the experience of being on the receiving end of violence not the inflicting of it) has nothing to do with the lofty ideals and integrity by which American pacifists claim to inform their practice. But it does explain the real nature of such curious phenomena as movement marshals, steadfast refusals to attempt to bring the seat of government to a standstill, even when a million people are on hand to accomplish the task, and the consistently convoluted victim blaming engaged in with regard to domestic groups such as the Black Panther Party.⁹⁰ Massive and unremitting violence in the colonies is appalling to right-thinking people but ultimately acceptable when compared with the unthinkable alternative that any degree of real violence might be redirected against “mother country radicals.”⁹¹

### Dehumanization

#### Political oppression thrives through erasure and dehumanization, the creation of groups of people who do not count as human, legitimating violence against them.

Ahmed ‘09 (Muneer I. , RESISTING GUANTÁNAMO: RIGHTS AT THE BRINK OF DEHUMANIZATION , by Northwestern University School of Law https://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=560120086072065006023118078083002005063062020029025039112121123081031091076001070068060031127103104029043095067117065092064113051020006028053099125069093124124073005020005127091082119004000127027106083066086109077084106025113075073099096009020000085&EXT=pdf)

When placed in a human rights frame, Guantánamo is often described in terms of the government‘s denial of rights to the prisoners, but equally important has been the denial of their humanity. Guantánamo has been a project of dehumanization, in the literal sense; it has sought to expel the prisoners—consistently referred to as ―terrorists‖—from our shared understanding of what it means to be human, so as to permit, if not necessitate, physical and mental treatment (albeit in the context of interrogation) abhorrent to human beings. This has been accomplished through three forms of erasure of the human: cultural erasure through the creation of a terrorist narrative; legal erasure through formalistic legerdemain; and physical erasure through torture. While these three dimensions of dehumanization are distinct, they are also interrelated. All are pervaded by law, and more specifically, by rights. This is to say that law has been deployed to create the preconditions for the exercise of a state power so brutal as to deprive the Guantánamo prisoners of the ability to be human. In this way, Guantánamo recalls Hannah Arendt‘s formulation of citizenship as the right to have rights.16 By this she meant that without membership in the polity, the individual stood exposed to the violence of the state, unmediated and unprotected by rights. The result of such exposure, she argued, was to reduce the person to a state of bare life, or life without humanity. What we see at Guantánamo is the inverse of citizenship: no right to have rights, a rights vacuum that enables extreme violence, so as to place Guantánamo at the center of a struggle not merely for rights, but for humanity—that state of being that distinguishes human life from mere biological existence.1

#### Human rights are fundamental and must be protected by any means necessary.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79) KL

The doctrine of any means necessary becomes powerful and morally defensible when it is analyzed in the context of human rights. Human rights obligations begin with a simple truth that "all human beings are born equal in dignity and rights." Any systematic violation of the basic human dignity of a group is oppression. Accordingly, those who control the legal means are under a clear obligation to promote and protect respect for fundamental human rights and freedoms. The protection of these rights for all is a duty and not an act of charity or a gesture of concession or goodwill on the part of those in power. Once this legal obligation is clearly articulated, the definition of oppression becomes apparent. Hence, any systematic denial of human rights constitutes oppression. Any violation of human rights must be condemned and corrected. This does not mean that individuals are allowed to resort to any means necessary whenever they subjectively conclude that they have been oppressed. Such a definition of oppression would weaken the very concept of social order without which no rights and freedoms can be realized. 181 Nor should the doctrine of any means necessary be the option of first resort, even if there is a systematic violation of human rights. Malcolm anchored the concept of freedom in the normative framework of human rights. His doctrine of any means necessary [\*130] must, therefore, be defined in the same context. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights explicitly recognizes the circumstances under which the oppressed will lose hope in the legal system and decide to rebel. It states, "if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, human rights should be protected by the rule of law."

#### Gaps and blindness drives oppression.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79)

In almost every legal system, some gap between law as written and law as enforced is inevitable. In a system of oppression, however, many discriminatory exceptions to the written law operate to deal with the oppressed. In an extreme case, it is quite possible that two distinct (formal) systems exist side by side: one for the oppressor and the other for the oppressed. In any discriminatory system the police will stop, search, or arrest members of the oppressed group more frequently and on a lower standard of suspicion. The police will also coerce them to confess or supply the incriminating evidence. Government prosecutors will be more prone to indict them, charge them with serious crimes, and bargain an uncompromising plea. Juries will be more inclined to convict them. Judges will give them harsher sentences. The oppressed face similarly degrading treatment in prisons. To further support the enforcement of oppressive laws, sociological myths will be created to label the oppressed, such as they have [\*] less regard for the law; they are violent by nature; or they pose a threat to public safety.

### Universal Human Rights

#### Liberation through legal means is impractical

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

Malcolm believed that oppressors in control of the legal machinery are morally unteachable, and it would be a waste of time to seek liberation through legal means. Thus, relying upon universal human rights principles, Malcolm invoked the concept of by any means necessary to confront the legal means which initiate, entrench, and prolong the oppressive system. Malcolm's message, however, neither fully explains the interaction between legal means and oppression nor does it explain, in any systematic way, the conditions under which the oppressed may reject legal means as a reliable vehicle for social change.

#### Demand of Universal Human Rights by the oppressed

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

Because Malcolm's life experiences were deeply rooted in the United States, his main moral mission was to seek liberation for the black people in this country. 24 Nonetheless, Malcolm was a powerful thinker whose conception of oppression applies to many situations in the world including foreign occupation, caste systems, and blatant discrimination. 25 In laying out a course of action to fight oppression, Malcolm refused to put his faith in the legal system of any particular [\*85] country. Alternatively, Malcolm relied upon universal human rights to demand justice and changes in the oppressive system. This shift from national to global standards for defining, as well as, fighting oppression makes Malcolm a powerful leader in the still emerging movement of human rights.

### Sexual Violence as Political Oppression

#### Sexual violence is a form of political oppression

Kaplan ’17 (Claire Kaplan, UVA Sexual Assault Educator; The Political/Social Context of Sexual Assault, http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/facultyfacts/2-1/politicl.html) [accessed 7/19/18 AT]

In part, this may have to do with the fact that most women still must struggle against a system which places them in a position of having to work harder, against difficult odds and a hostile climate, to gain acceptance in the world as human beings. Rape is an act of possession, of power, of control. It is used as a political tool in war (the Serbian "rape camps" are not a new concept; what is new is that they are institutionalized) as a means of social control and torture, and has been since the beginning of recorded history (witness the "comfort girls" in Japan and use of inmates for prostitution in Nazi concentration camps in WWII, mass rapes of hundreds of thousands of Bengali women during the Pakistani/Bengali war, rapes of school girls in Kenya, mass rapes of women by armed forces in Somalia and Guatemala), and yet only now is rape recognized as a form of political oppression and torture. Black feminists have compared the rape of women to the lynching of African-Americans. Comparatively, the assault of a college student may seem banal, yet the impact is unmistakable. Unlike men, who also suffer individually from sexual violence, women decline job promotions, avoid using library resources at specific times, or even all the time (because of the presence of molesters in the stacks) or the University's computer facilities late at night, even avoid night courses which may be critical to their academic careers, because of the fear of rape. The effect is a form of class oppression. In the United States the frequency of sexual violence is a reminder to all women that the struggle for equality is far from over; that in the end, they are still objects, still possessions of men.

#### Recognizing Domestic violence as a form of Political Oppression is the first step.

Pain 14 Pain, Rachel. Social & Cultural Geography, 2014. Vol. 15, No. 2, 127–150, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2013.862846

The long-standing feminist assertion that domestic violence is a form of political oppression (Dobash and Dobash 1992; Hammer 2002) is the starting point for the analysis here. Rates remain high in every country, and evidence grows that state responses developed in the late twentieth century have been only marginally effective (Phillips 2008; Walklate 2008). Domestic violence can also be understood as closely connected to other hegemonic forms of violence and militarism (Eisenstein 2007; INCITE! 2006; Moser 2001), and I have argued that, as violence that attempts political influence or control through instilling fear, it works as a form of terrorism (Pain forthcoming, 2013). Here, drawing on interviewees’ accounts of domestic violence, I explore their practices of resistance, suggesting that these constitute activism. The location of domestic violence in the private sphere and in intimate relationships, which often enable some degree of spatial entrapment, as well as the cultural meanings of domestic violence in wider society mean that this activism has a particular nature. It is largely undertaken alone, and in circumstances that are not only disempowering but that present immediate and continued physical and emotional danger, both to the person being abused and to others, especially children. There are rarely social relations of affinity or solidarity present which support and circulate other, more collective, activisms (for example, see Routledge 2012). The argument here builds on recent reconceptualisation of who and what an activist is. While traditional framings define activism and activists in masculinist terms, long-standing feminist analyses and geographical work have identified the small acts and ‘quiet politics’ of activism as significant (Askins in press; see also, Abrahams 1992; Martin, Hanson and Fontaine 2007; Staeheli, Ehrkamp, Leitner and Nagel 2012; Staeheli and Cope 1994). This work provides the foundation for understanding activism during domestic violence as part of a slow, difficult struggle against hegemony that is messy and rarely complete. The contestation of any linear notion of recovery and its subjects also informs the arguments here (Tamas 2011). To be understood as activism, personal struggle must connect with political and social change, and this problematic is grappled with towards the end of the paper.

#### Domestic Violence is a debilitating force that strips away the victim’s identity and social interactions. This is the epitome of oppression.

Williamson 10 Williamson, E. (2010) Living in the world of the domestic violence perpetrator: negotiating the unreality of coercive control, Violence Against Women 16: 1412–14

The psychological reactions that these interviewees describe were present for all interviewees. They may seem extreme to those who have not experienced this form of abuse. How a relationship that routinely invokes fear of harm can change the way that we think (and as Hennessey (2012) shows, these are real changes, rather than the responses of individuals somehow preconditioned to self-blame) underlines the earlier point that physical violence is not the only or main means of control in domestic abuse. As Williamson (2010: 1412 –1422) puts it, ‘it is those abuses that cannot be seen that are most difficult to deal with ... the perpetrator is guilty of a crime against identity and liberty’. Mind games and blame-laying are a common part of domestic violence. Prolonged abuse leads to specific forms of fear and trauma and ‘invades and erodes the personality’

#### Domestic Violence instills chronic fear in the victim leading to both immediate and long-term effects

Sokoloff 05 Sokoloff, N. J., & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic violence at the intersections of race, class, and gender: Challenges and contributions to understanding violence against marginalized women in diverse communities. Violence against women, 11(1), 38-64.

As time goes on, in every case this chronic fear escalated, as they came to inhabit an almost constant dread of abuse and developed detailed precautions to try to improve their security. This stress has physical manifestations that differ to those experienced in the moment of physical violence. Several interviewees used the metaphor of ‘treading on eggshells’ to describe this state, while Margie likens the feeling of chronic anxiety to a coiled spring; a lot of anxious effort is spent trying to predict what might trigger abusive behaviour and taking action to try and reduce its likelihood. As is well documented, this state of chronic fear and associated stress causes long-term damage to physical and mental health (Herman 1997; Scottish Women’s Aid 2010b, 2010c). Interviewees reported a range of symptoms while experiencing abuse including anxiety, depression, sleep and eating disorders, low self-esteem, self-harming and thoughts of suicide. Herman’s (1997) classic account of trauma links the experiences of survivors of violent atrocities including torture, concentration camps and domestic violence. She argues that complex trauma arises from a setting from which escape is difficult and a perpetrator who may appear ‘normal’. It is no surprise then that fear has a distinct texture in this setting; it is both immediate and long term, intimate and embedded within social relations, continuous (there is no easy escape or withdrawal from the source of harm) and compounded by spatial entrapment and abusers’ powerful justifications of their violence. Much evidence suggests that fear folds into certain psychological effects that are now recognised as created by domestic violence (Hennessey 2012; Herman 1997; Stark 2007).

#### Violence is sometimes silent –something as simple as inciting fear is violent.

Carver & Chambers ’13 (Terrell Carver & Samuel A. Chambers; Terrell Carver is Professor of Political Theory at the University of Bristol, UK. He has published extensively on issues relevant to sex, gender and sexuality in political theory and international relations. Samuel A. Chambers is Senior Lecturer in Politics at Swansea University, where he teaches political theory and cultural politics. He writes broadly in contemporary thought, including work on language, culture, and the politics of gender and sexuality; Judith Butler’s Precarious Politics: Critical Encounters, http://cachescan.bcub.ro/13-07-2016P/558737.pdf) [accessed 7/19/18]

As children, we were always told “sticks on stones may break my bones, but your words will never hurt,” to develop confidence against name-calling. Unfortunately, we’ve learned over time that verbal abuse is not just hurtful but psychologically damaging. Author Aisha Mirza wrote, “It’s not the bruises on the body that hurt. It is the wounds on the heart and the scares on the mind.” This is incredibly important when considering the impacts of psychological abuse within intimate partner relationships. Typically partners in a relationship strive to lift each other as individuals in order to enhance the partnership. Conversely, unhealthy and abusive relationships, one person seeks to have complete control and power by establishing systematic patterns of behaviors that weaken the victim physically and mentally. When we think of domestic violence, one image is the notorious black eye. However, in reality, nearly 50% of both women and men have reported experiencing “at least one psychologically aggressive behavior by an intimate partner.” Additionally, when abusive partners become physically violent, there is more than a 90% chance that there has been emotional abuse as well. Psychological abuse consists of various behaviors with the sole purpose of controlling someone by degrading their sense of self-worth. These actions include humiliation, embarrassment, isolation, denying access to resources, and convincing the victim that they are crazy – meaning that they can’t be trusted, even by themselves. Feeling inferior make it challenging to lead a healthy life and manage moods. The National Coalition against Domestic Violence notes that “psychological abuse is a stronger predictor of PTSD than physical abuse among women.” Trauma shatters our inherent global perspective that world and people in it are typically benevolent. This type of cognitive fracture impacts how we not only how we see others but ourselves and who we are within relationships. Experiencing psychosocial abuse from someone you love has long-term damages on the psyche and the soul. We think to ourselves, What did I do wrong? How can I change? No one will love me. I must have deserved this. When we think these thoughts, it’s hard to trust ourselves and, if we cannot trust ourselves, we experience the most intense feelings of alienation, aloneness. This silent violence knows no bounds. It does not discriminate against any one demographic. But telling someone who’s experiencing intimate partner violence, “I believe you” or “that’s not okay” can create a door to safety that they couldn’t see before.

#### Psychological Violence can be defined as violence that works on the soul.

Galtung, Johan 1969. (Johan Galtung received a Ph.D. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in sociology at the University of Oslo. He has also received thirteen honorary doctorates in his lifetime. “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research.” Journal of Peace Research, vol. 6, no. 3, 1969, pp. 167–191. Sage Publications Ltd., journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/002234336900600301.).

To approach this we shall start with two dimensions characterizing the violent action itself, or the mode of influence. The first distinction to be made is between physical and psychological violence. The distinction is trite but important mainly because the narrow concept of violence mentioned above concentrates on physical violence only. Under physical violence human beings are hurt somatically, to the point of killing. It is useful to distinguish further between ’biological violence’, which reduces somatic capability (below what is potentially possible), and ’physical violence as such’, which increases the constraint on human movements - as when a person is imprisoned or put in chains, but also when access to transportation is very unevenly distributed, keeping large segments of a population at the same place with mobility a monopoly of the selected few. But that distinction is less important than the basic distinction between violence that works on the body, and violence that works on the soul; where the latter would include lies, brainwashing, indoctrination of various kinds, threats, etc. that serve to decrease mental potentialities. (Incidentally, it is interesting that such English words as ’hurt’ and ’hit’ can be used to express psychological as well as physical violence: this doubleness is already built into the language.) The second distinction is between the negative and positive approach to influence. Thus, a person can be influenced not only by punishing him when he does what the influencer considers wrong, but also by rewarding him when he does what the influencer considers right. Instead of increasing the constraints on his movements the constraints may be decreased instead of increased, and somatic capabilities extended instead of reduced. This may be readily agreed to, but does it have anything to do with violence? Yes, because the net result may still be that human beings are effectively prevented from realizing their potentialities. Thus, many contemporary thinkers emphasize that the consumer’s society rewards amply he who goes in for consumption, while not positively punishing him who does not. The system is reward-oriented, based on promises of euphoria, but in so being also narrows down the ranges of action. It may be disputed whether this is better or worse than a system that limits the range of action because of the dysphoric consequences of staying outside the permitted range. It is perhaps better in terms of giving pleasure rather than pain, worse in terms of being more manipulatory, less overt. But the important point is, the awareness of the concept of violence can be extended in this direction, since it yields a much richer basis for discussion. The third distinction to be made is on the object side: whether or not there is an object that is hurt. Can we talk about violence when no physical or biological object is hurt? This would be a case of what is referred to above as truncated violence, but nevertheless highly meaningful. When a person, a group, a nation is displaying the means of physical violence, whether throwing stones around or testing nuclear arms, there may not be violence in the sense that anyone is hit or hurt, but there is nevertheless the threat of physical violence and indirect threat of mental violence that may even be characterized as some type of psychological violence since it constrains human action. Indeed, this is also the intention: the famous balance of power doctrine is based on efforts to obtain precisely this effect. And correspondingly with psychological violence that does not reach any object: a lie does not become more of a truth because nobody believes in the lie. Untruthfulness is violence according to this kind of thinking under any condition, which does not mean that it cannot be the least evil under some widely discussed circumstances.

### Narratives Key

#### Narratives are key to relating experiences of injustice that otherwise cannot be shared - they are crucial to cross-cultural communication

Young 2000 – professor in political science [Iris Marion, Inclusion and Democracy, pg 71-74]\*changed for abelist language [accessed 7/15/18]

Another mode of expression, narrative, serves important functions in democratic communication, to foster understanding among members of a polity with very different experience or assumptions about what is important. In recent years a number of legal theorists have turned to narrative as a means of giving voice to kinds of experience which often go unheard in legal discussions and courtroom settings, and as a means of challenging the idea that law expresses an impartial and neutral standpoint above all particular perspectives. Some legal theorists discuss the way that storytelling in the legal context functions to challenge a hegemonic view and express the particularity of experience to which the law ought to respond but often does not.20 Several scholars of Latin American literature offer another variant of a theory of the political function of storytelling, in their reflections on testimonio. Some resistance movement leaders in Central and South America narrate their life stories as a means of exposing to the wider literate world the oppression of their people and the repression they suffer from their governments. Often such testimonios involve one person’s story standing or speaking for that of a whole group to a wider, sometimes global, public, and making claims upon that public for the group. This raises important questions about how a particular person’s story can speak for others,21 and whether speaking to the literate First World public changes the construction of the story.22 While these are important questions, here I wish only to indicate a debt to both of these literatures, and analyse these insights with an account of some of the political functions of storytelling. Suppose we in a public want to make arguments to justify proposals for how to solve our collective problems or resolve our conflicts justly. In order to proceed, those of us engaged in meaningful political discussion and debate must share many things. We must share a description of the problem, share an idiom in which to express alternative proposals, share rules of evidence and prediction, and share some normative principles which can serve as premisses in our arguments about what ought to be done. When all these conditions exist, then we can engage in reasonable disagreement. Fortunately, in most political disputes these conditions are met in some respect and to some degree, but for many political disputes they are not met in other respects and degrees. When these conditions for meaningful argument do not obtain, does this mean that we must or should resort to a mere power contest or to some other arbitrary decision procedure? I say not. Where we lack shared understandings in crucial respects, sometimes forms of communication other than argument can speak across our differences to promote understanding. I take the use of narrative in political communication to be one important such mode. Political narrative differs from other forms of narrative by its intent and its audience context. I tell the story not primarily to entertain or reveal myself, but to make a point—to demonstrate, describe, explain, or justify something to others in an ongoing political discussion. Political narrative furthers discussion across difference in several ways. Response to the ‘differend’. Chapter 1 discussed how a radical injustice can occur when those who suffer a wrongful harm or oppression lack the terms to express a claim of injustice within the prevailing normative discourse. Those who suffer this wrong are excluded from the polity, at least with respect to that wrong. Lyotard calls this situation the differend. How can a group that suffers a particular harm or oppression move from a situation of total silencing and exclusion with respect to this suffering to its public expression? Storytelling is often an important bridge in such cases between the \*silenced experience of being wronged and political arguments about justice. Those who experience the wrong, and perhaps some others who sense it, may have no language for expressing the suffering as an injustice, but nevertheless they can tell stories that relate a sense of wrong. As people tell such stories publicly within and between groups, discursive reflection on them then develops a normative language that names their injustice and can give a general account of why this kind of suffering constitutes an injustice. A process something like this occurred in the United States and elsewhere in the 1970s and 1980s, as injustice we now call sexual harassment gradually came into public discussion. Women had long experienced the stress, fear, pain, and humiliation in their workplace 72 Inclusive Political Communication that courts today name as a specific harm. Before the language and theory of sexual harassment was invented, however, women usually suffered in silence, without a language or forum in which to make a reasonable complaint. As a result of women telling stories to each other and to wider publics about their treatment by men on the job and the consequences of this treatment, however, a problem that had no name was gradually identified and named, and a social moral and legal theory about the problem developed. Facilitation of local publics and articulation of collective affinities. Political communication in mass democratic societies hardly ever consists in all the people affected by an issue assembling together in a single forum to discuss it. Instead, political debate is widely dispersed in space and time, and takes place within and between many smaller publics. By a ‘local public’ I mean a collective of persons allied within the wider polity with respect to particular interests, opinions, and/or social positions.23 Storytelling is often an important means by which members of such collectives identify one another, and identify the basis of their affinity. The narrative exchanges give reflective voice to situated experiences and help affinity groupings give an account of their own individual identities in relation to their social positioning and their affinities with others.24 Once in formation, people in local publics often use narrative as means of politicizing their situation, by reflecting on the extent to which they experience similar problems and what political remedy for them they might propose. Examples of such local publics emerging from reflective stories include the processes of ‘consciousness-raising’ in which some people in the women’s movement engaged, and which brought out problems of battering or sexual harassment where these were not yet recognized as problems. Understanding the experience of others and countering preunderstandings. Storytelling is often the only vehicle for understanding the particular experiences of those in particular social situations, experiences not shared by those situated differently, but which they must understand in order to do justice

#### For our examination of the resolution we listen to the stories of abuse victims to observe the feeling of not just fear, but chronic oppression.

Pain 14 Pain, Rachel. Social & Cultural Geography, 2014. Vol. 15, No. 2, 127–150, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2013.862846

Jennifer: With him he would just blow, right, and it could be out of the blue, the first thing is shock, you know, and it’s like it’s a physical shock, I mean it’s like you know you are walking down the street and you see someone hit by a bus or you know something terrible happens. It’s like you stand there and you can’t believe, you cannot believe that this is happening. Meghan: He had his hands round my neck there and he just basically he was punching me about, and then he sort of got up off of me, and he was like ‘are you afraid?’ and I was like I thought ‘what the hell do I say?’ ... but I mean I was, I just was physically shaking because you just dinnae ken what’s going to happen next. Candy: I would actually physically start shaking or stutter because I was trying to say something to him ... and he would laugh about that, he would be like you know ‘what are you shaking at?’ and then just start laughing, and then because he saw that side he knew that anything he did would just frighten me. Kate: The feelings you know I remember when he was sort of screaming at me and we were in the middle of one of these scenes which were so horrifying, he would you know I would have these, I would feel the cascade of hormones you know, this kind of heat it was hot or cold or something but I could just feel it moving through me you know as your body kind of tries to cope ... it’s such a sort of intensity of stress hormones and I remember just Fear and activism during domestic violence 131 thinking this is so toxic for my body and then I was pregnant of course too ... the sort of physical sensation of anger and fear and distress and how intense that was…Ellie: When he came home from his work I was treading on eggshells and everything ... I felt terrible, I felt sick every time he came in from his work ... is he going to be pleased or is he going to come in in a bad mood? Am I going to get battered the night again or, everything’s just going through your mind and your stomach goes absolutely, you feel sick. Kate: Being exposed intimately to a crazy person is very scary ... I was always on eggshells. I mean I remember thinking this was like living in a house where, you know, say I’m walking around a room and there are particular points on the floor where I’m going to get an electric shock, and I never could know where those spots were. Emma: It feels like everything goes out of control and you’re trying to pull everything back into, you know, like all these wee eggs into this one wee basket to try and keep it in tight so that it doesn’t fly off the handle again, do you know what I mean? So you’re constantly on edge. So I’m not eating properly ... and that’s how I lived. Margie: It would come out of nowhere you know I’d be ... like a spring coiled up, that’s how I felt the whole time in the chest because I didn’t know when something like this was going to happen ... It was a tightness the whole time inside my chest. I was never relaxed, I was always tense that something could happen. Candy: It’s just to feel that fear before someone comes in, and then you know be really on edge the whole time that he’s actually around until the time that he’s fast asleep in bed, it’s just I don’t know how to describe it, it’s really it’s just it’s horrible, you’ve got a knot in your stomach the whole time and you 132 Rachel Pain just you know you’re like ‘oh my God is this going to make him go or is this going to make him go?’ Petunia: I ended up with stomach ulcers because I was internalising all of this ... like I noticed if somebody tapped me on the shoulder, I practically just, I didn’t realise I was on fight or flight all the time, I couldn’t just unwind

### Self-Defense

#### Retributive Justice, the idea of giving each person what they deserve, is morally correct and should be the definition of justice used in today’s round.

Ramakrishnan, Ketan 2011 (Ketan Ramakrishnan is a Graduate student of philosophy at the University of Oxford. “On the Celebration of Retributive Justice.” Harvard Political Review, Harvard University, 2 May 2011, harvardpolitics.com/united-states/weighing-in-in-defense-of-celebrating-retributive-justice/.).

American troops have killed Osama bin Laden, and the United States is right to take pride in their achievement. That’s my view, and the view of most others you’ll ask. Upon hearing the news last night, Americans congregated outside the White House and crowded into Times Square to celebrate; even in Harvard Yard, many of our classmates gathered to wave flags and sing the national anthem. But a few of us refuse to celebrate, as the smattering of contrary status updates on Facebook reveals. Most of these critics seem to agree with Sandra Korn, who argues in a recent HPR editorial that dispensing retribution as our troops did is wrong, and celebrating any human’s death is improper. Are such critics right? Certainly not. In certain circumstances, we are decidedly justified in celebrating the fulfillment of justice through retribution. Bringing about justice is a complex task, but the notion itself is simple enough. Justice is giving each what he or she deserves. The doling out of just deserts—whether in the form of medicine to the sick, or retribution to the utterly wicked—is the core of justice. Attempting to pursue retributive justice is, very often, impossible and counterproductive: hence the unequal application of the death penalty to minorities, and other such lapses. But the central idea itself, of restoring moral equilibrium as best we can, is a commitment integral to our moral consciousness, and one that is fundamentally sound. If the notion of desert has any significance, then, we should not hesitate to say that an unrepentant mass murderer deserves death. And celebrating the justice long due bin Laden’s victims, however unpleasant the task itself was, is something we should not be ashamed to do. This is not to say we should celebrate every instance of fitting retribution. Even when capital punishment is dispensed fairly, for example, the action being punished is often the product of deeply regrettable life circumstances; in the most cases, we should take no glee in such punishment. But when the person being punished is completely, unequivocally evil, this logic does not apply. No life circumstance excuses, even in part, the mass slaughter of innocents. To feel joy upon such a monster’s demise is natural, and quite alright—it is joy for his victim’s memories, and for the vindication of justice itself. This is all the more true because of who Osama bin Laden was. Not only did he murder thousands of Americans, but the ideology that led him to do so was one aimed at core ideals that Americans should genuinely take great pride in. The ideal of equality, as hard as it is to achieve, is integral to our national sense of self—it is the beating heart of our most vigorous debates, like the constitutional controversy over gay marriage. One need not mention the place of homosexuals, or women, in Osama bin Laden’s vision of the world. We should take pride in such ideals not because they are American ideals, but because they are morally admirable and deeply just. And, consequently, we should take pride when America stands up for them. We disagree, sometimes intractably, about what those ideals entail, but our national history has proved us committed to them, often at the cost of our blood. We are especially committed to the ideal of equality when it involves equal freedom, over one’s body and property and life choices. No one should doubt that Osama bin Laden was an enemy of equality, and freedom, and the rest of those overused, truly important words. In going after him, the United States affirmed the importance of those ideals—and the importance of justice for our dead, murdered pitilessly and en masse. In killing bin Laden, American soldiers secured that justice. So celebrate (and sing that hilariously profane song from Team America) in good conscience. The U.S. has every reason to be grateful for this success, and proud.

#### Oppressed peoples have a fundamental right to self defense.

Hurwitz 16, Ana. “20 Ways the Violence of the Oppressed Isn't the Same as the Violence of the Oppressors.” 20 WAYS THE VIOLENCE OF THE OPPRESSED ISN’T THE SAME AS THE VIOLENCE OF THE OPPRESSORS, Collectively Free, 2 Feb. 2016, www.collectivelyfree.org/violence-of-the-oppressed/.

“Oppressed peoples have a fundamental right to self defense. This self defense is characterized as “violence” because revolution is only seen as legitimate when it’s on the terms of the oppressors. By their rules. Because they set the rules.”

#### Revolution Violence is Self-Defense

Why Self-Defense is a Part of Revolutionary Black Love. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://afrikanblackcoalition.org/2015/11/18/selfdefense/

As Malcolm X once said, “it is criminal to teach a man not to defend himself when he is the constant victim of brutal attacks.” Self-defense is necessary in order to survive in the United States, and self-defense is rooted in self-love. A true revolution is rooted in radical love. And the foundation of love starts with loving one’s self and one’s people. If we truly love ourselves and our people, we will defend our lives and humanity by any means necessary when our lives are under attack. If we love ourselves, then we shall honor our people with the same love because Afrikan people have always had a linked-fate. As Black people, we share a common struggle under the beast of white supremacy. It’s simple: if someone we love is under attack, we must protect them from the aggressor. For instance, if I was walking down the street with my mom, and someone attacked her, I would attack the aggressor by any means necessary. Most people in their right mind would attack whoever is hurting their Mother. I would not want to be around a person who would not attempt to fight off this aggressor, because that means that they don’t have love for themselves and others. Revolutionary love is protecting each other and oneself by any means necessary to stop the aggressor.

#### Malcolm's self-help mentality is to challenge the oppressed to clean up their communities by using their own political, economic, moral, and intellectual resources.

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79)

Malcolm's message of liberation is pragmatic: it aims at changing the concrete conditions that cause subjugation and helplessness. Malcolm challenges the oppressed to clean up their communities by using their own political, economic, moral, and intellectual resources. [\*] Malcolm believed that this change was the reponsibility of each community that suffered "the effects of years of exploitation, neglect and apathy." This self-help mentality unleashes new energy in oppressed communities, minimizing dependence upon a system that has been unjust. This commitment to change from within, however, does not make the oppressor less menacing. The threat from the outside is not minimized. The fight against oppression takes on a new meaning: it is now rooted in the moral militancy of an organized and disciplined community

### Hypocrisy

#### Leaders who advocate for pacifism aren’t nonviolent themselves.

Churchill 2017 (Ward [Author & Political Activist], Pacifism as Pathology: Reflections on the Role of Armed Struggle in North America, 3rd Edition. Dexter, MI: PM Press. pp. 88,89-JS)

It is immediately perplexing to confront the fact that many of North America’s most outspoken advocates of absolute domestic nonviolence when challenging state power have consistently aligned themselves with the most powerful expressions of armed resistance to the exercise of U.S. power abroad. Any roster of pacifist luminaries fitting this description would include not only David Dellinger, but Joan Baez, Benjamin Spock, A.J. Muste, Holly Near, Staughton Lynd, and Noam Chomsky as well. The situation is all the more problematic when one considers that these leaders, each in his/her own way, also advocate their followers’ perpetual diversion into activities prefiguring the nature of a revolutionary society, the basis for which cannot be reasonably expected to appear through nonviolent tactics alone. This apparent paradox erodes a line of reasoning that, although it has probably never been precisely formulated within the North American nonviolent movement, seems likely to have informed the thinking of its more astute leadership. Its logical contours can be sketched as follows. Since at least as early as 1916, the importance of colonial and later neo colonial exploitation of the non industrialized world in maintaining modern capitalist states has been increasingly well understood by the revolutionary opposition within those states. Today, it is widely held that removal of neocolonial sources of material and superprofts would irrevocably undercut the viability of late capitalist states.

#### Changes in common language can aid in the elimination of the feeling of oppression

Kahn 1994 (Ali [Professor of Law at Washburn University] "Lessons from Malcom X: Freedom by Any Means Necessary." Howard Law Journal 38.79sb)

Malcolm aspired to change the nature of discourse about oppression. He knew that historically, those who were oppressed did not limit themselves to the language of the oppressor. In the United States, for example, the subjects of oppression created new forms of communication first through slave songs then through jazz. Thus, Malcolm invented a new language of liberation, encouraging others not to be limited by the conversation of that time. For Malcolm, the concepts of formal equality, desegregation, and civil rights were the language of acquiescence, not liberation; for him, the concepts of identity, self-reliance, and human rights were the language of liberation.

## Negative

### Negative Case

#### I Negate: Violent revolutions are a just response to political oppression.

#### I offer a value of Justice, which is defined as:

“Justice | Definition of Justice in English by Oxford Dictionaries.” Oxford Dictionaries | English, Oxford Dictionaries, en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/justice.

as, “The quality of being fair and reasonable.”

#### I support my value with a criterion of humanization, which is defined by Paulo Freire as the fundamental goal of revolution.

#### Contention One: The affirmative is on-face flawed: The oppressed cannot commit violence, because their violence is always a mirror of the oppressor.

Freire, Paulo 1968. (Paulo Freire was director of the Department of Cultural Extension of Recife University and was the Director of the Department of Education and Culture of the Social Service in the state of Pernambuco. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* 1968.).

Any situation in which "A" objectively exploits "B" or hinders his and her pursuit of self-affirmation as a responsible person is one of oppression. Such a situation in itself constitutes violence, even when sweetened by false generosity, because it interferes with the individual's ontological and historical vocation to be more fully human. With the establishment of a relationship of oppression, violence has already begun. Never in history has violence been initiated by the oppressed. How could they be the initiators, if they themselves are the result of violence? How could they be the sponsors of something whose objective inauguration called forth their existence as oppressed? There would be no oppressed had there been no prior situation of violence to establish their subjugation. Violence is initiated by those who oppress, who exploit, who fail to recognize others as persons—not by those who are oppressed, exploited, and unrecognized. It is not the unloved who initiate disaffection, but those who cannot love because they love only themselves. It is not the helpless, subject to terror, who initiate terror, but the violent, who with their power create the concrete situation which begets the "rejects of life." It is not the tyrannized who initiate despotism, but the tyrants. It is not the despised who initiate hatred, but those who despise. It is not those whose humanity is denied them who negate humankind, but those who denied that humanity (thus negating their own as well). Force is used not by those who have become weak under the preponderance of the strong, but by the strong who have emasculated them. For the oppressors, however, it is always the oppressed (whom they obviously never call "the oppressed" but—depending on whether they are fellow countrymen or not—"those people" or "the blind and envious masses" or "savages" or "natives" or "subversives") who are disaffected, who are "violent," "barbaric," "wicked," or "ferocious" when they react to the violence of the oppressors. Yet it is—paradoxical though it may seem—precisely in the response of the oppressed to the violence of their oppressors that a gesture of love may be found. Consciously or unconsciously, the act of rebellion by the oppressed (an act which is always, or nearly always, as violent as the initial violence of the oppressors) can initiate love. Whereas the violence of the oppressors prevents the oppressed from being fully human, the response of the latter to this violence is grounded in the desire to pursue the right to be human. As the oppressors dehumanize others and violate their rights, they themselves also become dehumanized. As the oppressed, fighting to be human, take away the oppressors power to dominate and suppress, they restore to the oppressors the humanity they had lost in the exercise of oppression. It is only the oppressed who, by freeing themselves, can free their oppressors. The latter, as an oppressive class, can free neither others nor themselves. It is therefore essential that the oppressed wage the struggle to resolve the contradiction in which they are caught; and the contradiction will be resolved by the appearance of the new man: neither oppressor nor oppressed, but man in the process of liberation. If the goal of the oppressed is to become fully human, they will not achieve their goal by merely reversing the terms of the contradiction, by simply changing poles. This may seem simplistic; it is not. Resolution of the oppressor-oppressed contradiction indeed implies the disappearance of the oppressors as a dominant class. However, the restraints imposed by the former oppressed on their oppressors, so that the latter cannot reassume their former position, do not constitute oppression. An act is oppressive only when it prevents people from being more fully human. Accordingly, these necessary restraints do not in themselves signify that yesterdays oppressed have become today's oppressors. Acts which prevent the restoration of the oppressive regime cannot be compared with those which create and maintain it, cannot be compared with those by which a few men and women deny the majority their right to be human.

#### Contention Two: We must reject violence, or be locked in an endless cycle of violence.

Butler 2009 (Judith [American Philosopher] "The Claim of Nonviolence" Frames of War: When is Life Grievable? London: Verso. pp. 165-185)

We are at least partially formed through violence. We are given genders or social categories, against our will, and these categories confer intelligibility or recognizability, which means that they also communicate what the social risks of unintelligibility or partial intelligibility might be. But even if this is true, and I think it is, it should still be possible to claim that a certain crucial breakage can take place between the violence by which we are formed and the violence with which, once formed, we conduct ourselves. Indeed, it may be that precisely because one is formed through violence, the responsibility not to repeat the violence of one's formation is all the more pressing and important. We may well be formed within a matrix of power, but that does not mean we need loyally or automatically reconstitute that matrix throughout the course of our lives.

#### Contention Three: Using violence to respond to oppression is significantly less effective than nonviolence

Lakey ’12 (George Lakey; co-founder of the Earth Quaker Action Group, college professor, led 1,500 workshops on five continents, activist on local, national, and international levels, author, his first arrest was for a civil rights sit-in and most recent was with Earth Quaker Action Team while protesting mountain top removal coal mining, “The More Violence, The Less Revolution,” 3/6/12, https://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/the-more-violence-the-less-revolution/) [accessed 7/17/18 AT]

Many regimes are so oppressive that people will give their lives to change them, even without guarantees that the new regime will be a whole lot better. But as we consider what we want out of our sacrifices to the cause, we should ask: What’s the track record of movements that depend on violence to overthrow their regimes? Political scientists (and Waging Nonviolence contributors) Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan analyzed 323 attempts at regime change between 1900 and 2006. They were curious about the comparative success of violent and nonviolent campaigns, among other things. They found that violent campaigns succeeded 26 percent of the time, and that nonviolent campaigns succeeded 53 percent of the time. The good news is that regimes can be overthrown, even though dictators bring out the police and army to try to stay in power. The bad news is that the people didn’t always win; when they used violence they won only one time in four. They did, however, double their chances of success when they used a nonviolent strategy.

### Extensions

### The Oppressed Cannot be Violent

#### Violence is a condition of oppression, not revolution.

Butler 2009 (Judith [American Philosopher] "The Claim of Nonviolence" Frames of War: When is Life Grievable? London: Verso. pp. 165-185)

State violence often articulates itself through the positing of the sovereign subject. The sovereign subject poses as precisely not the one who is impinged upon by others, precisely not the one whose permanent and irreversible injurability forms the condition and horizon of its actions. Such a sovereign position not only denies its own constitutive injurability but tries to relocate injurability in the other as an effect of doing injury to that other and exposing that other as, by definition, injurable. If the violent act is, among other things, a way of relocating the capacity to be violated (always) elsewhere, it produces the appearance that the subject who enacts violence is impermeable to violence. The accomplishment of this appearance becomes one aim of violence; one locates injurability with the other by injuring the other and then taking the sign of injury as the truth of the other. The specific moralization of this scene takes place when the violence is "justified" as "legitimate" and even "virtuous," even though its primary purpose is to secure an impossible effect of mastery, inviolability, and impermeability through destructive means. To avow injurability does not in any way guarantee a politics of non-violence. But what may well make a difference would be the consideration of precarious life, and so too injurability, as a generalized condition, rather than as a differential way of marking a cultural identity, that is, a recurrent or timeless feature of a cultural subject who is persecuted or injured by definition and irregardless of historical circumstance. In the first instance, the "subject" proves to be counter-productive for understanding a shared condition of precariousness and interdependency. In the second instance, the "subject" is re-installed and becomes defined by its injury (past) and injurability (present and future).12 If a particular subject considers her- or himself to be by definition injured or indeed persecuted, then whatever acts of violence such a subject commits cannot register as "doing injury," since the subject who does them is, by definition, precluded from doing anything but suffering injury. As a result, the production of the subject on the basis of its injured status then produces a permanent ground for legitimating (and disavowing) its own violent actions. As much as the sovereign subject disavows his injurability, relocating it in the other as a permanent repository, so the persecuted subject can disavow his own violent acts, since no empirical act can refute the a priori presumption of victimization.

#### By labeling those who are oppressed as “violent”, oppressors can effectively justify and maintain their control. They can effectively shift the blame of their actions to the victim. This type of oppression, known as civil oppression, can take many forms and serves to dehumanize those who are victimized by it.

Harvey, J. 2002 (Jean Harvey was the Professor of Philosophy at the University of Guelph. “Social Privilege and Moral Subordination.” Journal of Social Philosophy, Wiley Online Library, 19 Dec. 2002, onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/0047-2786.00039.).

It is a commonly held belief that serious oppression requires dramatic and fairly brutal mechanisms to be at work, like physical attack, imprisonment, torture, or at least the threats of such acts. But this is one of the great myths about oppression. In Western industrialized societies the most common forms of oppression are all what I call civilized oppression (where neither physical force nor the use of law is the main mechanism.) To those not affected, even those with compassion and goodwill, it is often not visible until made visible, yet it is far from trivial. The main claim I wish to make about oppression is that it is rooted in distorted and morally inappropriate relationships, which underlie and contribute to harms of a more tangible kind (like poverty or unemployment). These relationships, then, form the first level of inquiry, and they typically involve nonpeers—people who differ significantly with respect to power and status. Moral subordination (in a sense to be developed) involves the distortion of some basic relationships and is a standard component of civilized oppression. The existence of different degrees of social status and privilege provides fertile ground for such subordination. In fact, I will argue that given all that social privilege involves, the danger of contributing to moral subordination is built in and can be prevented only by reflective and active measures. I conclude that as a result, certain challenging moral obligations accompany privileged positions. Oppression involves a systematic and inappropriate control of people by those with more power. The oppressed are treated with disrespect, moral rights are denied or blocked, their lives are deprived of proper fulfillment, and they experience series of frustrations and humiliations beyond all normal bounds. Except for explicit denials of rights, none of these need be intentional, and when no physical force is used, a lack of awareness on the part of contributing agents is more common than not. Oppression can involve death, unemployment, tedious employment, homelessness, or humiliation, but it is the contributory relationships that reveal the oppression. After all, we can be homeless because of a hurricane. Leaving someone homeless may well be oppressive, since much oppression involves selective abandonment, but the sheer being without a home may not be. Even something not attributable to natural causes, like a violent assault, may not be oppressive. Judith Andre writes that ”[o]ppression is systematic; a single assault—even murder—is not oppressive, for there are many categories of human evil besides that of oppression. The constant fear of attack, however, may well be oppressive.” The harms do not result from isolated acts of individual malice or negligence. One person cannot be repeatedly murdered, but murder can be used repeatedly to terrorize a group, and groups of people are the targets of oppression. This said, individual victims of oppression are standardly recipients of cumulative harms, with a compounding significance not grasped by the more fortunate, especially when the oppression takes a civilized form.

### Violence Fails

#### Violent resistance only causes more violence, and backfires on those who use strategies premised on violence.

Chenoweth and Stephan 2008, (Erica (Assistant Professor of Government at Wesleyan University and a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs in the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University) and Maria J. (Director of Educational Initiatives at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict) “Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict” International Security, Vol. 33, No. 1, Summer 2008, pp.7-44. -KL)

We argue that nonviolent resistance may have a strategic advantage over violent resistance for two reasons. First, repressing nonviolent campaigns may backfire. In backfire, an unjust act—often violent repression—recoils against its originators, often resulting in the breakdown of obedience among regime supporters, mobilization of the population against the regime, and international condemnation of the regime.19 The internal and external costs of repressing nonviolent campaigns are thus higher than the costs of repressing violent campaigns. Backfire leads to power shifts by increasing the internal solidarity of the resistance campaign, creating dissent and conflicts among the opponent’s supporters, increasing external support for the resistance campaign, and decreasing external support for the opponent. These dynamics are more likely to occur when an opponent’s violence is not met with violent counter reprisals by the resistance campaign and when this is communicated to internal and external audiences.20 The domestic and international repercussions of a violent crackdown against civilians who have publicized their commitment to nonviolent action are more severe than repression against those who could be credibly labeled as “terrorists” or “violent insurgents.”21 Internally, members of a regime—including civil servants, security forces, and members of the judiciary—are more likely to shift loyalty toward nonviolent opposition groups than toward violent opposition groups. The coercive power of any resistance campaign is enhanced by its tendency to prompt disobedience and defections by members of the opponent’s security forces, who are more likely to consider the negative political and personal consequences of using repressive violence against unarmed demonstrators than against armed insurgents.22 Divisions are more likely to result among erstwhile regime supporters, who are not as prepared to deal with mass civil resistance as they are with armed insurgents.23 Regime repression can also backfire through increased public mobilization. Actively involving a relatively larger number of people in the nonviolent campaign may bring greater and more sustained pressure to bear on the target, whereas the public may eschew violent insurgencies because of physical or moral barriers. Externally, the international community is more likely to denounce and sanction states for repressing nonviolent campaigns than it is violent campaigns. When nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) sympathize with the cause, nonviolent campaigns are more appealing as aid recipients. External aid may or may not advance the cause of the campaign.24 The external costs of repressing nonviolent campaigns can be high, however, especially when the repression is captured by the media. External actors may organize sanctions against repressive regimes that repeatedly crack down on unarmed protestors.25 Although sanctions are possible in the case of violent insurgencies as well, they are less likely. Instead, some foreign states may actually aid a regime in crushing the violent insurgents. Other foreign states may lend material support to a violent resistance campaign in an attempt to advantage it against its opponent. Indeed, state sponsorship of violent insurgencies and terrorist groups has been an ongoing foreign policy dilemma for decades.26 Whether state-sponsored violent groups have succeeded in obtaining their strategic goals is unclear.

#### Violent protesting gives security a legitimate reason to use harsher methods

Finlay, C. J., 2018, (July 17. Is violent political protest ever justified? Retrieved from http://theconversation.com/is-violent-political-protest-ever-justified-72630 -JS)

For current protester leaders to encourage violence would be both morally unjustified and a serious tactical mistake. The outcome of any struggle between them and the government will be decided in large part by public opinion: if protesters can be blamed for starting violence, that will elevate the administration and its supporters. And worse yet, it might also help legitimise harsher methods by the security forces in response.

#### The Civil Rights Movement Would Have Failed if it was Violent

Simkins, Chris. (January 2014) “Non-Violence Was Key to Civil Rights Movement.” VOA, VOA, 20 Jan. 2014, www.voanews.com/a/nonviolencekey-to-civil-rights-movement/1737280.html.

The success of the of the American Civil Rights Movement and the fight for racial equality in the United States is a testament to the determination of millions of African Americans who fought against discrimination in the 1960s. On January 20, 2014, Americans use the national holiday to recognize the efforts of the civil rights leader, Rev. Martin Luther King. A major factor in the success of the movement was the strategy of protesting for equal rights without using violence. Civil rights leader Rev. Martin Luther King championed this approach as an alternative to armed uprising. King's non-violent movement was inspired by the teachings of Indian leader Mahatma Gandhi. Led by King, millions of blacks took to the streets for peaceful protests as well as acts of civil disobedience and economic boycotts in what some leaders describe as America's second civil war. The non-violent movement was tested in places like Birmingham, Alabama. "During that period of time you had people who were being murdered, homes being bombed, churches being bombed and there was a sense that evil would prevail," said William Bell, Birmingham’s current mayor. A 1965 march for voting rights in Selma, Alabama is remembered as "Bloody Sunday." Congressman John Lewis led the march. "They came toward us, beating us with night sticks, trampling us with horses, releasing the tear gas,” said Lewis. “I was hit in the head by a state trooper with a night stick. I had a concussion on the bridge and I thought I was going to die." Andrew Young, one of King's closest aides, called for calm against a backdrop of outrage. "If we had started guerilla warfare in America’s cities, if we had given into terrorism in America, we could not have won but America could not have survived," said Young. In Birmingham images of police using attack dogs and fire hoses to disperse protesting school children were broadcast around the world. "The violence was being perpetrated by the oppressors, not the oppressed and that was an incredibly powerful message and an incredibly important tool during the movement," said Richard Cohen an attorney with the Southern Poverty Law Center. In August 1963 thousands of African Americans and whites gathered for the March on Washington. It was peaceful with no arrests. But just weeks after the March on Washington, tragedy struck in Birmingham when a bomb exploded at the 16th Street Baptist Church during Sunday school classes. Four young girls were killed and 23 others injured. It was an awful blow for Dr. King and the civil rights movement. Shirley Gavin Floyd, a friend of one of the victims, was traumatized by the hate killings. "I was scared to look at a white person and I was scared to go anywhere I thought a white person was because I had really believed that could easily happen to me," said Gavin. Many blacks wanted to retaliate. Among them Congressman Bobby Rush, who in the 1960's was a member of the militant group known as the Black Panthers. "I thought that Dr. King was too milquetoast, too passive, and I didn't understand the power of non-violence,” said Rush. “So I didn't adhere to his philosophy and turned the other cheek." Ben Jealous, president of The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the nation's oldest civil rights organization, said the non-violent campaign won American hearts and minds. "The movement was moving towards a crescendo that we would see in 1964 and 1965 when landmark civil rights legislation was passed," said Jealous.

Non-violence successfully resulted in the Orange Revolution in Ukraine.

Karatnycky, Adrian (April 2005) https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russia-fsu/2005-03-01/ukraines-orange-revolution

"Together, we are many! We cannot be defeated!" Emerging from a sea of orange, the mantra signaled the rise of a powerful civic movement, a skilled political opposition group, and a determined middle class that had come together to stop the ruling elite from falsifying an election and hijacking Ukraine's presidency. Over the next 17 days, through harsh cold and sleet, millions of Ukrainians staged nationwide nonviolent protests that came to be known as the "orange revolution." The entire world watched, riveted by this outpouring of the people's will in a country whose international image had been warped by its corrupt rulers. By the time victory was announced--in the form of opposition leader Viktor Yushchenko's electoral triumph--the orange revolution had set a major new landmark in the postcommunist history of eastern Europe, a seismic shift Westward in the geopolitics of the region. Ukraine's revolution was just the latest in a series of victories for "people power"--in Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia in the late 1980s and, more recently, in Serbia and Georgia.

#### Violence and nonviolence are synthesizing forces.

Butler 2009 (Judith [American Philosopher] "The Claim of Nonviolence" Frames of War: When is Life Grievable? London: Verso. pp. 165-185)

Indeed, the one who responds is crafted forcibly by norms that often do a certain kind of violence, and may well dispose that subject towards a certain kind of violence as well. So violence is not foreign to the one to whom the address of non-violence is directed; violence is not, at the start, presumptively "outside." Violence and non-violence are not only strategies or tactics, but form the subject and become its constitutive possibilities and, so, an ongoing struggle. To say this is to suggest that non-violence is the struggle of a single subject, but also that the norms that act upon the subject are social in nature, and the bonds that are at stake in the practice of non-violence are social bonds. Thus, the singular "one" who struggles with non-violence is in the process of avowing its own social ontology.

#### Violence does not have to be normalized.

Butler 2009 (Judith [American Philosopher] "The Claim of Nonviolence" Frames of War: When is Life Grievable? London: Verso. pp. 165-185)

The idea of iterability is crucial for understanding why norms do not act in deterministic ways. And it may also be the reason why performativity is finally a more useful term than "construction."2 Even if we were able to describe the "origin" of norms and to offer a description outside of a fictional rendition, what use would it be? If the aims of a norm cannot be derived from its origins (as Nietzsche clearly tells us, for instance, with regard to legal conventions), then even if norms originated in violence it would not follow that their fate is only and always to reiterate the violence at their origin. And it would also still be possible that, if norms do continue to exercise violence, they do not always do so in the same way. Moreover, it would have to be shown that the violence at the origin is the same as the violence exercised in the iterations that produce the norm through time.

#### The state could bring more arms to bear than the people could ever hope, or have the will, to fight with

Johnson ’14 (Dan Johnson; President and founder of the Solutions Institute, “Is it Time for a Violent Revolution?” 9/24/14, http://solutions-institute.org/is-it-time-for-a-violent-revolution/) [accessed 7/17/18 AT]

When you take on the state with violence, you are spitting in the face of empire. By the lowest estimates, American police departments alone have 432 mine-resistant vehicles, 435 armored vehicles, nearly 50,000-night vision pieces, 533 aircraft, nearly 100,000 machine guns, and nearly 200,000 magazines. Add American military might, even if only half of the troops took the state’s side, and you’re looking at over 700,000 active military and 400,000 reserve personnel. That’s just manpower. Count land and air units, and not only would it be an unwinnable war, it would be over before it started. That’s if you were lucky enough to start the war in the first place. Between the massive surveillance apparatus of the NSA, FBI, and DHS, and the operations of said agencies, including infiltration of everything from online forums to activist groups, any kind of coordination would be next to impossible. On a moment’s notice, the President could send a message to every smartphone in America giving your information and a number to call if they find you. What about the people? The overwhelming response to the actions of Jared and Amanda has been condemnation, with the actions of Justin Borque “Rambo” in Moncton eliciting a similar response. The worst thing one can be in today’s society is a “cop-killer,” while thousands of innocent Americans are processed through TSA checkpoints every hour without a word. A vote being a general meter of public interest, Senator Lindsey Graham, who supported and passed a law allowing the President to detain Americans indefinitely without charge or trial, easily won his primary. There have been no major policy changes forced by the people since the execution of at least 4 American citizens, 16 year-old Abdulrahman Al-Awlaki, Anwar Al-Awlaki, Samir Khan, and Jude Kennan Mohammed without charge or trial. We should never be scared of the state, but to ignore their capabilities is to underestimate our opponent. They would not only have more military might than any revolutionaries could dream of, they would also have the people on their side. They would win in any kind of physical war.

#### Partaking in violence risks losing your humanity

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action.

The practice of nonviolence touches on something fundamental about human nature, about who we wish to be as individuals or as a people. Gandhi stated simply, “Nonviolence is the law of our species.”1 Dr. Vandana Shiva, a renowned leader of rural resistance in India, said in a recent lecture that if we do not adopt nonviolence we risk compromising our humanity. Likewise, Iraqi Kurdish activist Aram Jamal Sabir said that although nonviolence may be harder and may require greater sacrifice than violence, “at least you don’t lose your humanity in the process.”

#### Violence destroys people and the knowledge and truth that they possess, thereby reducing the potential to understand and know truth.

Gan, Barry L. 2013 (Barry L. Gan is a Professor Philosophy and Director of the Center for Nonviolence at St. Bonaventure University. Violence and Nonviolence: An Introduction. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013.). CM

James Lawson described the dynamic of violent action as: “Do as I wish, or I will hurt you until you cry ‘uncle.’” But the dynamic of nonviolent strategic action is, in capsule form: “Do as I wish, or make me suffer.” Although many contemporary advocates of strategic nonviolent resistance would reject this self-suffering aspect of the dynamic of nonviolent action, the rationale for such a dynamic can be found in Gandhi’s philosophy. Gandhi believed that nothing finite—no stone, no cow, no human being—can comprehend Truth, can comprehend all that is. Thus, as was mentioned earlier, for Gandhi, to destroy something that exists is to destroy a little bit of Truth, to preclude oneself from coming closer to ultimate reality, for Gandhi equated God and Truth. So, for Gandhi, at least, nonviolence is a means to Truth, a means to God. Thus, one must stand for what one believes is true, but since each one of us is finite, one must not do violence to another being, for in doing so one reduces the possibility of attaining Truth. Put less abstractly, there is always more than one story to a conflict. To destroy one such story in a conflict, to prevent one side from presenting their views or from having their day in court, is to do violence to Truth. Conflicts are not solved by one side prevailing over another; they are solved by all sides coming to a workable understanding. Thus, pragmatically speaking, one should not do harm to other parties to a conflict because such harm interferes with coming to a workable understanding; the dynamic of violence—Do as I wish or I will hurt you until you cry “uncle”—is far less effective than the dynamic of nonviolence—Do as I wish or make me suffer. There is another advantage to the nonviolent dynamic: often one party does violence to another because that party fears the other. A group that refuses to do violence of any sort under any conditions to another party goes a long way toward reducing the fear that the one party has of the other. And if the fear can be overcome, or at least diminished, then meaningful communication and understanding can, perhaps, begin. But meaningful communication and understanding can- not take place when both sides are doing all they can to harm each other.

### Violence as a Political Strategy Backfires

#### North Korean nuclear proliferation is an example of a violent response to political oppression.

Tillet, Emily (April 2017) “North Korea Says It Has Right to ‘Self Defense’ after Missile Launch.” CBS News, CBS Interactive, 29 Aug. 2017, www.cbsnews.com/news/north-korea-self-defense-missile-launch/.

In the wake of North Korea's latest missile launch, an official said the country was justified to exercise its right to "self defense," the Reuters news agency reports. On Tuesday, North Korea's ambassador to the United Nations in Geneva, Han Tae Song, accused the U.S. of driving the Korean peninsula toward an "extreme level of explosion," claiming the United States has "openly declared its hostile intentions" toward the country. Han said in response to the U.S. and South Korea holding "aggressive" joint military exercises in the region, "despite repeated warnings," his country has "every reason to respond with tough counter-measures." While the ambassador did not explicitly refer to Monday's latest ballistic missile launched over Japan, Han warned the U.S. that it would be "wholly responsible for the catastrophic consequences it will entail." Following the missile launch, Japan's Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and President Trump discussed over the phone the U.N. ramping up further pressure on North Korea and calling for an international response to the growing tensions in the region. The two called for an emergency meeting of the U.N. Security Council to address these concerns. Mr. Trump, who earlier this month warned of "fire and fury" for the regime in response to its earlier missile launches, issued a new charge to the North, saying that "all options are on the table" to respond to the increasing threat posed by the country.

#### Incels Feel Politically Oppressed By Women

Tolentino, J. (2018, May 15). The Rage of the Incels. Retrieved from https://www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/the-rage-of-the-incels

In the past few years, a subset of straight men calling themselves “incels” have constructed a violent political ideology around the injustice of young, beautiful women refusing to have sex with them. These men often subscribe to notions of white supremacy. They are, by their own judgment, mostly unattractive and socially inept. (They frequently call themselves “subhuman.”) They’re also diabolically misogynistic. “Society has become a place for worship of females and it’s so fucking wrong, they’re not Gods they are just a fucking cum-dumpster,” a typical rant on an incel message board reads. The idea that this misogyny is the real root of their failures with women does not appear to have occurred to them. The incel ideology has already inspired the murders of at least sixteen people. Elliot Rodger, in 2014, in Isla Vista, California, killed six and injured fourteen in an attempt to instigate a “War on Women” for “depriving me of sex.” (He then killed himself.) Alek Minassian killed ten people and injured sixteen, in Toronto, last month; prior to doing so, he wrote, on Facebook, “The Incel Rebellion has already begun!” You might also include Christopher Harper-Mercer, who killed nine people, in 2015, and left behind a manifesto that praised Rodger and lamented his own virginity. The label that Minassian and others have adopted has entered the mainstream, and it is now being widely misinterpreted. Incel stands for “involuntarily celibate,” but there are many people who would like to have sex and do not. (The term was coined by a queer Canadian woman, in the nineties.) Incels aren’t really looking for sex; they’re looking for absolute male supremacy. Sex, defined to them as dominion over female bodies, is just their preferred sort of proof. If what incels wanted was sex, they might, for instance, value sex workers and wish to legalize sex work. But incels, being violent misogynists, often express extreme disgust at the idea of “whores.” Incels tend to direct hatred at things they think they desire; they are obsessed with female beauty but despise makeup as a form of fraud. Incel culture advises men to “looksmaxx” or “statusmaxx”—to improve their appearance, to make more money—in a way that presumes that women are not potential partners or worthy objects of possible affection but inconveniently sentient bodies that must be claimed through cold strategy. (They assume that men who treat women more respectfully are “white-knighting,” putting on a mockable façade of chivalry.) When these tactics fail, as they are bound to do, the rage intensifies. Incels dream of beheading the sluts who wear short shorts but don’t want to be groped by strangers; they draw up elaborate scenarios in which women are auctioned off at age eighteen to the highest bidder; they call Elliot Rodger their Lord and Savior and feminists the female K.K.K. “Women are the ultimate cause of our suffering,” one poster on incels.me wrote recently. “They are the ones who have UNJUSTLY made our lives a living hell… We need to focus more on our hatred of women. Hatred is power.”

#### The violent revolution in Libya has caused more destruction than positive consequences

Poljarevic, E. 2012, (May, Libya's Violent Revolution. European University Institute, Via della Badia dei Roccettini, Italy. pg. 12-JS)

However, something changed in Libya that disrupted the public’s passivity, allowing them to overcome their fear. The Libyan popular uprising in February 2011 can be attributed first of all to a turning point in the growth of the 11 regime-critical section of the population, and, second, to the precipitous falls of the two neighboring countries’ long-term authoritarian regimes. These two status quo disrupting processes contributed to initiate the first period of the transition during which popular demands for improved public services evolved into political claims-making events. These increasingly more demanding events climaxed on February 16 when about 500 people gathered in the central square of Benghazi to demonstrate against the regime. The seemingly well-prepared protesters seemed to have a particular demand, the release of several human rights advocates, including the lawyer Fathi Terbil arrested just days before. The protesters used gasoline-filled bottles as home-made bombs and on this particular occasion the security forces cracked down on the protest first with water cannons and then with rubber bullets, and then resorted to live ammunition (Cowell 2011; Reuters 2011b). The security forces were supported by civilians who were identified as Gaddafi loyalists (interview no. 3). Other cities, such as Bayda to the northeast of Benghazi, developed into demonstration hotspots which attracted the security forces’ attention and caused escalating violence between the growing amount of protesters and the police. For instance, as a result of swelling protests and violent security tactics a police station in Bayda was burned to the ground on February 16 (Gebauer 2011). In Benghazi protesters organized a provisional camp in the middle of the city, mirroring the focal protest hub against the regime in Cairo’s Tahrir square (Jacinto 2011). The security forces quickly moved against the demonstrators with brutal force. Again, in Benghazi a large part of the demonstrators expressed long-held grievances, with many people were calling for justice for those families affected by the regime’s 1996 massacre of prisoners and voicing numerous other complaints against the regime’s policies. Aware of the danger the escalation of protests posed, the regime released over a hundred imprisoned Islamists, instantly signaling its increased concern to both the general public and the demonstrators (HRW 2003; ICG 2011; Cruickshank and Lister 2011).

### Defenses of Violence 🡪 Self Fulfilling Prophecy

#### Violent and militaristic institutions suppress the ideology of nonviolence

Woon 2014 (Chih Yuan [Geopolitics Professor at the National University of Singapore], Precarious geopolitics and the possibilities of nonviolence, Progress in Human Geography, Vol. 38, pp. 656 [KD])

Nonviolence as an ideology and practice has existed throughout the millennia (Megoran, 2008). In tracing the history of peace movements and ideas, Cortright (2004) suggests that the genealogy of nonviolence is rooted in various forms of religious propagations including Taoism, Hinduism and Christianity. Other writers have also been active in documenting pre-modern instances of nonviolent actions (see Sharp, 1973; Zunes et al., 1999). Indeed, while the numerous historical examples refute the novelty of nonviolent endeavours, critiques have emerged to highlight the lack of systematic theorizations of such initiatives, with nonviolent strategies hardly developed or analysed with the same energy and resources as military and other violent means. In the words of Zunes et al. (1999: 1): ‘We have no large nonviolent academies that parallel our military academies or widespread units of peace brigades stationed to intervene nonviolently in crisis situations’.

#### Violent thought in geopolitics leads directly to international oppression and violence.

Woon 2014 (Chih Yuan [Geopolitics Professor at the National University of Singapore], Precarious geopolitics and the possibilities of nonviolence, Progress in Human Geography, Vol. 38, pp. 658 [KD])

There are various examples that would fit well into this paradigm (Dalby, 2010; Koopman, 2007; Special Issue of Political Geography 30(4)). One good reference point is Flint’s (2011: 43) critical reflections on the longstanding role of the geographical discipline in ‘facilitating killing, either directly or indirectly’. Flint exposes how geographical conceptualizations of place, scale and territory (as commonly mobilized and understood in the realm of popular geopolitical imaginations) provide the organizing principles behind ‘just war’ theory, and hence how they are readily misused to legitimate unjust violent endeavours. Specifically, Flint argues that the morality of war is usually framed in terms of the necessity of eradicating the deviant ‘Other’, one who is often neatly compartmentalized into the exclusive boundary of a nation-state. Such a territorial view of the world, according to Flint, precludes the possibility of cross-cultural cooperation and, crucially, ignores the agendas of power. In advancing such critiques of just wars, Flint (2011: 43) concludes in brevity that it is important to develop and maintain the debate as to ‘how geography can inform an understanding of the world that is based on nonviolence as an underlying foundational social principle’. The manner in which nonviolence is normatively gestured (as compared to the elaborate critiques of warfare) almost suggests its status as the taken-for-granted alternative to violence. In such a formulation, there is the assumption that the key to motivating nonviolent action is to enable people to be spatially aware of the existence of violence in different geographical locations and recognize their embeddedness in different networks of entanglement.

### Nonviolence is Successful

#### Nonviolence is the best way to achieve the end goal of any revolution

Lakey ’12 (George Lakey; co-founder of the Earth Quaker Action Group, college professor, led 1,500 workshops on five continents, activist on local, national, and international levels, author, his first arrest was for a civil rights sit-in and most recent was with Earth Quaker Action Team while protesting mountain top removal coal mining, “The More Violence, The Less Revolution,” 3/6/12, https://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/the-more-violence-the-less-revolution/) [accessed 7/17/18 AT]

Bottom line: for those around the world who are committed to change and are considering violence as the way to get it, a track record is still a track record. Movements relying on violence were only half as likely as nonviolent movements to win a new regime, and even then, didn’t do as well as their nonviolent cousins in establishing democracy in the new society. There’s no reason to link “violence” with that fine word “radical”—especially if by radical you mean democratic and egalitarian. Yes, violence has accomplished a lot of change in the world, but its track record is mediocre when it comes to the goals of the Occupy movement.

#### Nonviolent Action allows for neutral or third parties to side with the non-violent and therefore increases the likelihood of success for the nonviolent oppressed.

Gan 2013 (Barry L. Gan is a Professor Philosophy and Director of the Center for Nonviolence at St. Bonaventure University. Violence and Nonviolence: An Introduction. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013.). CM

To begin with, in every conflict, one finds two parties—or more—at odds with each other. However, often one also finds others who have little stake in the outcome of the conflict, or at least who believe they have very little stake in the outcome of the conflict. Nonviolent strategy engages those third parties in ways that violent conflict cannot. How? In violent conflicts, all parties to the conflict are engaged in causing harm to the other parties in very obvious ways. Sympathies of parties more or less external to the conflict are not roused so easily. The outsiders see the vicious behavior on the part of all the parties in the conflict. But if one party to the conflict steadfastly refuses to engage the other side violently, then the violent treatment of that side by the opposing side elicits sympathy and wonder from those who would normally stand on the sidelines. The uninvolved parties wonder why the nonviolent party to the conflict is being treated so badly when it is clear that they do not wish to bring physical harm to anyone. The more one side suffers, nonviolently, at the hands of the other, violent side, the less likely is the violent side to win more and more advocates to their cause. This can and often does lead to an increase of power—in Sharp’s sense of the term—to those engaged in nonviolence and a decrease in power to those engaged in violence: people withdraw their tacit support for the violent side, and with that withdrawal of support is a sapping of their material and nonmaterial resources. Even those engaged in enforcing policies violently may come to have second thoughts about what they are doing and may lose their balance. Gene Sharp calls this effect political jiu-jitsu. He describes it as a loss of balance felt by those who use violence against nonviolent adversaries. The effect has been observed in many nonviolent struggles, and it is a crucial pivot point for strategic nonviolent action. Nonviolent strategy relies on generating this loss of balance among one’s opponents. A familiar example, Gandhi’s Salt March, will help to illustrate this effect.

#### Non-violent revolutions achieve success more often than violent revolutions, creating many more benefits.

Chenoweth and Stephan 2008, (Erica (Assistant Professor of Government at Wesleyan University and a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs in the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University) and Maria J. (Director of Educational Initiatives at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict) “Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict” International Security, Vol. 33, No. 1, Summer 2008, pp.7-44. -KL)

Extant literature provides explanations as to why nonviolent campaigns are effective means of resistance.4 Little of the literature, however, comprehensively analyzes all known observations of nonviolent and violent insurgencies as analogous resistance types.5 This study aims to fill this gap by systematically exploring the strategic effectiveness of violent and nonviolent campaigns in conflicts between nonstate and state actors using aggregate data on major nonviolent and violent resistance campaigns from 1900 to 2006.6 To better understand the causal mechanisms driving these outcomes, we also compare our statistical findings with historical cases that have featured periods of both violent and nonviolent resistance. Our findings show that major nonviolent campaigns have achieved success 53 percent of the time, compared with 26 percent for violent resistance campaigns.7 There are two reasons for this success. First, a campaign’s commitment to nonviolent methods enhances its domestic and international legitimacy and encourages more broad-based participation in the resistance, which translates into increased pressure being brought to bear on the target. Recognition of the challenge group’s grievances can translate into greater internal and external support for that group and alienation of the target regime, undermining the regime’s main sources of political, economic, and even military power. Second, whereas governments easily justify violent counterattacks against armed insurgents, regime violence against nonviolent movements is more likely to backfire against the regime. Potentially sympathetic publics perceive violent militants as having maximalist or extremist goals beyond accommodation, but they perceive nonviolent resistance groups as less extreme, thereby enhancing their appeal and facilitating the extraction of concessions through bargaining.8 Our findings challenge the conventional wisdom that violent resistance against conventionally superior adversaries is the most effective way for resistance groups to achieve policy goals. Instead, we assert that nonviolent resistance is a forceful alternative to political violence that can pose effective challenges to democratic and nondemocratic opponents, and at times can do so more effectively than violent resistance.

#### Non violence protests work to achieve mass participation which is what influences leaders to resign

Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. J., 2016, (January 18. How the world is proving Martin Luther King right about nonviolence. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/01/18/how-the-world-is-proving-mlk-right-about-nonviolence/?noredirect=on&utm\_term=.45fa5d85fd48-JS)

To many people, this conclusion may seem naive, but when we drilled into the data, we found that nonviolent resistance campaigns don’t succeed by melting the hearts of their opponents. Instead, they tend to succeed because nonviolent methods have a greater potential for eliciting mass participation — on average, they elicit about 11 times more participants than the average armed uprising — and because this is the source of major power shifts within the opponent regime. Mass participation that draws on diverse segments of society tends to empower and co-opt reformers while cutting off hard-liners from sources of support. When such participation is nonviolent, it increases the chances of pulling the regime’s support from the leadership, allowing security forces, economic elites and civilian bureaucrats to shift their loyalties with less fear of bloody retribution. In other words, we found that nonviolent resistance is effective not necessarily because of its conversion potential but rather because of its creative, co-optive and coercive potential — a theory that Albert Einstein Institution founder Gene Sharp has articulated for decades. Naturally, not all nonviolent campaigns succeed. But in cases where they failed, there was no good systematic evidence to suggest that violent uprisings would have performed any better.

#### Non-violent revolutions are more successful in shifting loyalties.

Chenoweth and Stephan 2008, (Erica (Assistant Professor of Government at Wesleyan University and a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs in the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University) and Maria J. (Director of Educational Initiatives at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict) “Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict” International Security, Vol. 33, No. 1, Summer 2008, pp.7-44. -KL)

Second, nonviolent resistance campaigns appear to be more open to negotiation and bargaining because they do not threaten the lives or well-being of members of the target regime. Regime supporters are more likely to bargain with resistance groups that are not killing or maiming their comrades. Correspondence inference theory suggests why nonviolent campaigns may be more appealing to the mass public and more persuasive to regime supporters. The theory posits that a person makes judgments about how to respond to an adversary based on the adversary’s actions, which advantages nonviolent resistance in two ways.27 First, public support is crucial to any resistance, but publics view nonviolent campaigns as physically nonthreatening and violent campaigns as threatening.28 Nonviolent campaigns appear more amenable to negotiation than violent campaigns, regardless of how disruptive they are. In the face of regime repression, the public is less likely to support a violent campaign that is equally repressive or, at best, careless about civilian casualties. Given a credible alternative, the public is more likely to support a nonviolent campaign.29 Second, when violent insurgents threaten the lives of regime members and security forces, they greatly reduce the possibility of loyalty shifts. Abrahms finds that terrorist groups targeting civilians lose public support compared with groups that limit their targets to the military or police.30 Surrendering or defecting to a violent movement involves greater risk, because the group could kill or torture members of the regime and the regime could violently punish deserters. Because explicitly nonviolent methods do not physically threaten members of the security forces or a regime’s civil servants, members of the regime are more likely to shift loyalties toward nonviolent movements rather than toward violent ones. When the regime can no longer rely on the continued cooperation of its security forces or other groups crucial to its control, its grip on power is undermined.

#### Empirical studies have shown that nonviolent revolution is more effective than violent revolution.

Howes 2013 (Dustin Ells [David J. Kriskovich Professor of Political Science at Louisiana State University] "The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence" Perspectives on Politics 11.2 (June 2013): 427-426.) CM

One kind of evidence for the success of nonviolence comes from empirical political science. The idea that war is an empirical problem has driven a generation of research in political science and peace studies. Recently, scholars in this tradition have turned their attention to nonviolence and the techniques pacifists have developed, with a particular emphasis on "people power" movements or "civil resistance" in opposition to governments. In the main, these studies have asked why civil resistance movements succeed or fail, an issue I will discuss later. But Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephans groundbreaking 2011 study examines the question of the political effectiveness of civil resistance relative to violent insurrection. Chenoweth and Stephan examine all known cases of armed and unarmed insurrections from 1900 to 2006 (323 cases) and find that the use of nonviolence greatly enhanced the chance of success for campaigns seeking to oust regimes and slightly increased the chance of success in anti-occupation and territorial campaigns. Their findings hold across regime type, suggesting that authoritarian regimes are no less vulnerable to nonviolent tactics. They also find that nonviolent campaigns that topple regimes are much more likely to beget democratic institutions. Finally, they find that both the frequency and the success rate of nonviolent insurrections are increasing. Yet even these remarkable findings do not quite capture the pivotal role nonviolence has played in epochal political changes. In world historical perspective, the spread of democracy is perhaps the most important political trend of the last three centuries. Chenoweth and Stephans study suggests that in the last century, at least, nonviolence played a critical role in creating and solidifying democratic regimes. However, the spread of democracy would be much less meaningful if it had not been accompanied by two other changes that have been largely achieved through nonviolence. The first is the legal abolition of slavery. Slavery had been banned by individual political entities even in ancient times, but for almost all of human history some or most governments allowed or directly participated in slavery.66 Slave rebellions occurred throughout history, sometimes numbering in the thousands, but only one, the Haitian Revolution (1791-1804), ever succeeded. The American Civil War might be considered a second case where violence led to abolition. However, the end of legally sanctioned slavery was achieved for the most part through nonviolent techniques which, as discussed above, were theorized and developed by pacifist abolitionists. By encouraging and assisting thousands of runaway slaves (many of whom themselves became abolitionists), boycotting products made by slave labor, tirelessly speaking and organizing international conventions, publishing newspapers and pamphlets, founding political parties and pressuring politicians, nineteenth and twentieth century abolitionists brought an end to the most lucrative and dynamic slave system in the history of the world. Despite the extraordinary violence of slavery itself and the vicious violence used to defend the institution from abolitionists and slaves who dared to claim freedom, the goal of making slavery illegal in every country in the world was mostly accomplished without violent revolutions. The second epochal event is the entry of women into politics in large numbers. Women have always had an important influence on politics, have sometimes resisted male dominance with violence, and have sometimes played an important role in violent revolutions alongside men. However, the mid-nineteenth century women s movement, growing out of the abolitionist movement, was of a different character both in terms of its grand ambitions and distinctive political techniques. Early feminists took on a wide range of issues from property ownership to the right to vote and hold elective office. But among their most radical claims was the notion that women in general were capable of and suited for public, political action. Through rallies and meetings, declarations and hunger strikes, political organizing and public campaigning, they precipitated a historic change in the relationship between women and government. Despite brutal repression and ongoing organized and institutional resistance by men, women have been able to dismantle and replace the patriarchal legal structures in a large number of countries. Their achievements have been gained without a single violent revolution. Along with this evidence for the relative effectiveness of nonviolence, there is gathering evidence for the ineffectiveness of violence in a variety of empirical literatures. Careful studies of military power show that, counter- intuitively, states with greater material capabilities are no more likely to win wars, or even battles, than states with lesser material capabilities. Moreover, the likelihood that materially strong actors will lose wars has increased dramatically over the last two centuries. The effectiveness of violence used by governments to control their populations has also been called into question. Decades of research on the death penalty has been unable to establish that it reduces crime. Studying the effectiveness of torture is a controversial issue, but qualitative studies drawing upon first-person accounts suggest that it is generally an ineffective way to garner reliable information.

### Non-Violence Works

#### The practice of nonviolence is a struggle, and even contains moments of violence, but the struggle is crucial to the ethical life, because violence as violence always reasserts itself.

Butler 2009 (Judith [American Philosopher] "The Claim of Nonviolence" Frames of War: When is Life Grievable? London: Verso. pp. 165-185)

Indeed, non-violence as an ethical "call" could not be understood if it were not for the violence involved in the making and sustaining of the subject. There would be no struggle, no obligation, and no difficulty. The point is not to eradicate the conditions of one's own production, but only to assume responsibility for living a life that contests the determining power of that production; in other words, that makes good use of the iterability of the productive norms and, hence, of their fragility and transformability. The social conditions of my existence are never fully willed by me, and there is no agency apart from such conditions and their unwilled effects. Necessary and interdependent relations to those I never chose, and even to those I never knew, form the condition of whatever agency might be mine. And though not all unwilled effects are "violent," some of them are impingements that are injurious, acting forcibly on the body in ways that provoke rage. This is what constitutes the dynamic bind or "struggle" that is non-violence. It has, I would submit, nothing to do with cleansing or expiating violence from the domain of normativity, nor does it involve finding and cultivating an ostensibly non-violent region of the soul and learning how to live according to its dictates.4 It is precisely because one is mired in violence that the struggle exists and that the possibility of non-violence emerges. Being mired in violence means that even as the struggle is thick, difficult, impeding, fitful, and necessary, it is not the same as a determinism-being mired is the condition of possibility for the struggle for non-violence, and that is also why the struggle so often fails. If this were not the case, there would be no struggle at all, but only repression and the quest for a false transcendence. Non-violence is precisely neither a virtue nor a position and certainly not a set of principles that are to be applied universally. It denotes the mired and conflicted position of a subject who is injured, rageful, disposed to violent retribution and nevertheless struggles against that action (often crafting the rage against itself). The struggle against violence accepts that violence is one's own possibility. If that acceptance were not there, if one postured rather as a beautiful soul, as someone by definition without violent aggression, there could be no ethical quandary, no struggle, and no problem. Such a position of virtue or principle of purity would disavow or repress the violence from which such positions are wrought. It is crucial to distinguish between (a) that injured and rageful subject who gives moral legitimacy to rageful and injurious conduct, thus transmuting aggression into virtue, and (b) that injured and rageful subject who nevertheless seeks to limit the injury that she or he causes, and can do so only through an active struggle with and against aggression. The first involves a moralization of the subject that disavows the violence it inflicts, while the latter necessitates a moral struggle with the idea of non-violence in the midst of an encounter with social violence as well as with one's own aggression (where the social encounter and the "one's own" transitively affect one another).

#### Nonviolent resistance combats systematic state violence in geopolitics by mobilizing grassroots forces.

Woon 2014 (Chih Yuan [Geopolitics Professor at the National University of Singapore], Precarious geopolitics and the possibilities of nonviolence, Progress in Human Geography, Vol. 38, pp. 659 [KD])

This is, however, not to imply that that no geographical works have gone beyond discursive appeals for nonviolence to explore its 658 Progress in Human Geography 38(5) actual workings. Emanating chiefly from the social movements literature, these studies do not actually invoke the term nonviolence (for an exception, see Zunes et al., 1999), preferring to couch their arguments in terms of resistance politics towards the injustices and repercussions of warfare (Oslender, 2004, 2007). But this should not diminish the fact that nonviolent approaches (albeit not named as such) have been adopted and mobilized by these mass movements to forward their own interests/agendas. For instance, Routledge (1996, 2003) has been involved in a large number of projects that focus on resistance practices around much of the so-called ‘developing’ world. Through these case studies, Routledge is able to demonstrate how nonviolent actions can help enact what he calls ‘anti-geopolitics’ – challenges to ‘both material geopolitical power of states and political institutions and the representations imposed by political and economic elites upon the world and its people to serve their geopolitical interest’ (Routledge, 2003: 237). Alternatively, Koopman (2011) goes one step further to elucidate the merits of focusing not only on the geographies of activist movements, but also on how academics can become involved in building solidarity and forming alliances with marginalized, disenfranchised groups (for similar arguments, see Askins, 2009; Mason, 2013). By being part of the international accompaniment team in Colombia, Koopman highlights how ‘western’ volunteers actively rely on their ‘privileged’ bodies to shield and protect precarious lives.

#### Non-violence praxis is both successful and key to being a just human being.

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. pp. 1-12)

In the years since Mahatma Gandhi demonstrated the power of nonviolence to free India from colonial rule and Martin Luther King Jr. employed it to liberate people of color from some of their oppression in the United States, countless peoples around the world— from Manila to Moscow, Cape Town to Cairo, and in the Occupy movements worldwide—have had varying degrees of success using one or another aspect of nonviolence to loosen the bonds of exploitation and oppression. The practice of nonviolence touches on something fundamental about human nature, about who we wish to be as individuals or as a people. Gandhi stated simply, “Nonviolence is the law of our species.”1 Dr. Vandana Shiva, a renowned leader of rural resistance in India, said in a recent lecture that if we do not adopt nonviolence we risk compromising our humanity. Likewise, Iraqi Kurdish activist Aram Jamal Sabir said that although nonviolence may be harder and may require greater sacrifice than violence, “at least you don’t lose your humanity in the process.”2

#### Non-violence pushes humans forward in the historical narrative.

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. pp. 1-12)

It is not surprising, therefore, that here and there the significance of nonviolence has begun to be recognized by people looking for a new story of human nature and human destiny, who find themselves searching for a badly needed higher image of humanity. Frankly, our present worldview and the institutions based on that worldview take violence as a norm, and shifting that basis could lead to a leap forward in cultural evolution. It could resolve or show us how to resolve our economic, environmental, personal, and international problems. In short, the full recognition of nonviolence could rewrite the story of human destiny.

#### Nonviolence is more complex than violent response, but it creates successful outcomes.

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. pp. 1-12)

As King put it, “The phrase ‘passive resistance’ often gives the false impression that this is a sort of ‘do-nothing method’ in which the resister quietly and passively accepts evil. But nothing is further from the truth. For while the nonviolent resister is passive in the sense that he is not physically aggressive toward his opponent, his mind and emotions are always active, constantly seeking to persuade his opponent that he is wrong.” To be angry at injustice and to fear harm are natural human responses. The point is not whether we have the “right” to be frightened or outraged but how we can use that fear or outrage to change a situation most effectively. As a preeminent nonviolence scholar, Gene Sharp, has pointed out, the first thing an oppressed people must do is to overcome the paralyzing fear that has kept them down.7 In Chile, for instance, constitutional means were enough to bring down Augusto Pinochet in 1989 and to end the nation’s long nightmare of military rule, but first they had to overcome their fear, which gave them the creative power for action.

#### Nonviolence allows for a greater number of participants to join the movement, thereby increasing the movement’s likelihood of success.

Howes 2013 (Dustin Ells [David J. Kriskovich Professor of Political Science at Louisiana State University] "The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence" Perspectives on Politics 11.2 (June 2013): 427-426.) CM

Instead, their arguments for the most part are consistent with the conventional wisdom (and the failure of pacifism), which affirm the distinction between good and bad violence. Goldsteins main thesis is that UN peace- keeping has played a crucial role in reducing warfare, and Pinker s core claim is that a great deal of the reduction in the overall violence in the world can be attributed to the "pacifying" violence of powerful states. Neither notes that not only has war decreased, but the rate of victory for attackers as opposed to defenders fell dramatically in the last quarter of the twentieth century and they do not consider Jonathan Schell's related claim that "cooperative power" - as opposed to physical violence - has become the "political bedrock of our unconquerable world." While it may be correct that certain applications of violence can produce a net benefit in terms of reducing violence, another explanation or contributing factor seems equally viable. The development and expansion of the techniques of nonviolence may have made violence less politically effective and, therefore, less useful and "necessary" over time. Second, Chenoweth and Stephan argue that nonviolence has a critical and distinctive advantage over violence in resisting governments. Their data shows that nonviolence is much more likely to attract "high levels of diverse participation" and that the number of people participating in a campaign increases the probability of success. They posit that the superiority of nonviolence on this score is due to the relatively low entry cost for participants. Active participation in violent campaigns requires physical skills and abilities that participation in nonviolent campaigns may not. Violent campaigns tend to attract young, able-bodied men but nonviolence can draw from a much wider pool of participants. Critical-mass theories of collective action suggest that open, mass action can lead to a decline in peoples' perception of risk, whereas violent campaigns may increase perceptions of risk. Moral barriers to participation in nonviolence are lower and indeed, nonviolence can potentially mobilize "the entire aggrieved population," whereas many may find participation in a violent campaign morally objectionable. These factors suggest a connection between Schocks claims regarding the diversity of nonviolent tactics and Chenoweth and Stephans claim that nonviolence has a distinct advantage when it comes to participation. Civil resistance campaigns can draw upon participants with "varying levels of commitment and risk tolerance" because nonviolent campaigns can make use of those who are willing to place their lives on the line in direct action but also those who are more risk averse but willing to stay home in a boycott or strike. Violent campaigns, however, generally require participants to have high levels of commitment and risk tolerance. A third factor in the effectiveness of nonviolence is the ability of such campaigns to disarm their opponents through defections and shifts in loyalty in security forces. In a book appearing concurrently with Chenoweth and Stephans volume, Sharon Nepstad studies civil resistance in China, East Germany, Panama, Chile, Kenya, and the Philippines. The three cases where the campaigns ended in success all involved security force defections and she traces how those campaigns were able to effect them while the others did not. She notes that defections can come from the top down as in Chile, the bottom up as in East Germany, or some mix of the two as in the Philippine case. Sticking rigorously to nonviolence, the presence of a shared collective identity among the soldiers and the resisters, and a critical-mass dynamic where troops were more willing to defect when they were aware that other soldiers were doing so, all seem to have played a role. Nepstad’s broad claim, that security force defections play a critical role in success, are generally reinforced by Chenoweth and Stephans large-n findings. They show that nonviolent campaigns are more likely than violent campaigns to pro- duce security force defections and that such defections improve the chance of success by nearly 60 percent. Even when violent campaigns manage to garner wide- spread participation, their use of violence prevents them from fully realizing the effect numbers have on encouraging defections in nonviolent campaigns. Chenoweth and Stephan note that the defections of civilian bureaucrats, economic elites, and others may be important as well, but are more difficult to measure and observe. Both studies show that nonviolence tends to "pull apart the opponent s pillars of support" whereas violence is more likely to "push them together."

#### Nonviolence is the only revolutionary strategy that preserves humanity

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. Pp.2 [KD])

The practice of nonviolence touches on something fundamental about human nature, about who we wish to be as individuals or as a people. Gandhi stated simply, “Nonviolence is the law of our species.”1 Dr. Vandana Shiva, a renowned leader of rural resistance in India, said in a recent lecture that if we do not adopt nonviolence we risk compromising our humanity. Likewise, Iraqi Kurdish activist Aram Jamal Sabir said that although nonviolence may be harder and may require greater sacrifice than violence, “at least you don’t lose your humanity in the process.”

#### Nonviolence is applicable to all situations, not just conflict.

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. Pp.7-8 [KD])

Nonviolence, as a fundamental energy, is quietly operating at all times, like gravity. We tend to use the term nonviolence only when some kind of conflict erupts, especially between a people and their government, but the thing itself is working unnoticed in many other areas and can be used in any situation, from national revolutions to personal interactions. Therefore, although my examples in this book mainly focus on people who find themselves in an insurrectionary movement, all of us can benefit from understanding the dynamics of this force. Anyone who is confronted by one of the many forms of violence in our world (whether this is outright force or an inequity built into a system) and feels called upon to assert his or her human dignity against that violence can benefit from taking a nonviolent stance toward all living things. My hope is that this book, in conjunction with the various resources listed in the back, can help activists understand the main principles underlying the dynamics of nonviolent action, but with a little imagination anyone can use these principles in their daily life. They can become our way of life.

#### Nonviolence is a complicated praxis, because it always begs the question of “for whom.”

Butler 2009 (Judith [American Philosopher] "The Claim of Nonviolence" Frames of War: When is Life Grievable? London: Verso. pp. 165-185)

Conversely, every group is not only delimited from another, but composed of a differentiated assemblage, which presumes that singularization constitutes an essential feature of sociality. The problem, however, cannot be definitively answered through recourse to such arguments, even though they are, in my view, crucial to any critical consideration of non-violence. We have to ask "non-violence against whom?" and "non-violence against what?" There are distinctions to be made, for instance, between violence against persons, against sentient beings, against property, or against the environment. Moreover, there are forms of violence that are meant to counter or to stop other violence: the tactics of self-defense, but also the violence enacted in the name of combating atrocity or famine or other humanitarian crises, or in revolutionary efforts to institute a democratic politics.

#### Non violence draws positive attention

Howes 2013 (Dustin Ells [David J. Kriskovich Professor of Political Science at Louisiana State University] "The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence" Perspectives on Politics 11.2 (June 2013): 427-426.)

The second half of this article examines how the success of nonviolence and the research that examines nonviolence can form a feedback loop that informs a new brand of pacifism. Pragmatic pacifism reformulates pacifism as a principled commitment to non violence grounded in a realistic understanding of the historical record and the inherent political liabilities of violence. Through the study of cases from five continents, large-n statistical analyses, and reconsiderations of the writings of Mahatma Gandhi, scholars have constructed the elements of a people-centered theory of power. The use of nonviolence draws our attention to how people organize themselves, which studies of nonviolence and recent studies of military power suggest play a decisive role in achieving political success and military victory. These studies give us a rich understanding of what makes political action - including violence - effective and ineffective. They also show that nonviolent methods show distinct advan- tages over violent methods because nonviolence is carefully attuned to perennial political realities that those who use violent methods tend to ignore.

#### non violence is self-limiting and self-regulated

Howes 2013 (Dustin Ells [David J. Kriskovich Professor of Political Science at Louisiana State University] "The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence" Perspectives on Politics 11.2 (June 2013): 427-426.)

Against the conventional wisdom, pragmatic pacifism maintains that the advocates of violence are prone to unreal- istic ideological commitments that are often doomed to failure, whereas nonviolence offers a self-limiting, prag- matic, and realistic approach that accounts for the mani- fold difficulties of politics. In contrast to traditional pacifism, which rejects violence on moral grounds, this brand of pacifism relies upon political as opposed to moral principles to make the case against violence. Violence may be immoral, but recent empirical and theoretical work pushes us toward the perhaps more important insight that violence is counterproductive to politics. Since the use of nonviolence in practice is motivated by a wide variety of moral, material, and political aims, a more full comple- ment of reasons and principles for rejecting violence gives this brand of pacifism a better chance of political success

#### Nonviolent campaigns have become increasingly common

Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. J., 2016, (January 18. How the world is proving Martin Luther King right about nonviolence. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/01/18/how-the-world-is-proving-mlk-right-about-nonviolence/?noredirect=on&utm\_term=.45fa5d85fd48-JS)

If you feel as though we live in a particularly disruptive time in history, you’re right. But it’s the kind of disruption that is unique to our time. The Major Episodes of Contention project (a data project run by Professor Erica Chenoweth at the University of Denver) suggests that nonviolent resistance campaigns have become the modal category of contentious action worldwide. The NAVCO Data Project, a separate data collection project using different source material and inclusion criteria, shows similar patterns, as do a variety of other protest data sets. Whereas the frequency of violent insurgencies — defined with a 1,000-battle death threshold — has declined since the 1970s, campaigns relying primarily on nonviolent resistance have skyrocketed. Note that these figures refer specifically to maximalist campaigns, meaning their goals are to remove the incumbent national leadership from power or to create territorial independence through secession or expulsion of a foreign military occupation or colonial power. In the first five years of the current decade alone, we have seen more onsets of new nonviolent campaigns than during the entire 1990s, and almost as many as were observed during the 2000s. Our current decade is on track to be the most contentious decade on record.

#### Participating in Nonviolence allows an oppressed group to lose their fear of the oppressors.

Gan, Barry L. 2013 (Barry L. Gan is a Professor Philosophy and Director of the Center for Nonviolence at St. Bonaventure University. Violence and Nonviolence: An Introduction. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013.). CM

There is another advantage to the nonviolent dynamic: often one party does violence to another because that party fears the other. A group that refuses to do violence of any sort under any conditions to another party goes a long way toward reducing the fear that the one party has of the other. And if the fear can be overcome, or at least diminished, then meaningful communication and understanding can, perhaps, begin. But meaningful communication and understanding can- not take place when both sides are doing all they can to harm each other.

#### The evolution from violence to nonviolence creates better politics

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. pp. 1,2-JS)

The twentieth century left us a double legacy. On the one hand, it was a time of great cruelty and violence; on the other hand, and perhaps from that very crucible of violence, we saw manifestations of a new kind of power—or rather, new uses of an age—old power—that can lead humanity to a far better future. In the years since Mahatma Gandhi demonstrated the power of nonviolence to free India from colonial rule and Martin Luther King Jr. employed it to liberate people of color from some of their oppression in the United States, countless peoples around the world—from Manila to Moscow, Cape Town to Cairo, and in the Occupy movements worldwide—have had varying degrees of success using one or another aspect of nonviolence to loosen the bonds of exploitation and oppression. The practice of nonviolence touches on something fundamental about human nature, about who we wish to be as individuals or as a people. Gandhi stated simply, “Nonviolence is the law of our species.” Dr. Vandana Shiva, a renowned leader of rural resistance in India, said in a recent lecture that if we do not adopt nonviolence we risk compromising our humanity. Likewise, Iraqi Kurdish activist Aram Jamal Sabir said that although non violence may be harder and may require greater sacrifice than violence, “at least you don’t lose your humanity in the process.”

#### Spread of nonviolent thought demands rejection of violence.

Nagler 2014 [KD] (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. pp.12)

That human beings have the potential to be nonviolent—and to respond to nonviolence when it’s offered—implies a much higher image of the human being than we are presented with in the mass media and throughout our present culture, but because of that very culture, we can’t expect our nonviolent potential to manifest by itself. To bring it to fruition we must first try to understand it better and get into the habit of using it creatively in our relationships, our institutions, and our culture. Then, to use it in situations of intense conflict such as Birmingham, there are two basic ingredients that make the nonviolent magic work:1. We approach our situation with right intention. We are not and do not need to be against the well-being of any person.2. We employ right means. Wrong means such as violence can never, in the long run, bring about right ends.

#### Enlightenment to nonviolent thinking overcomes prejudice, hatred, and base passions.

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. Pp.11 [KD])

Gandhi, who had seen this working time and again, gave a beautiful explanation of how this transformation takes place: “What satyagraha does in these cases is not to suppress reason but to free it from inertia and to establish its sovereignty over prejudice, hatred, and other baser passions. In other words, if one may paradoxically put it, it does not enslave, it compels reason to be free.” What he calls “reason” here is better described as the innate awareness that we are all connected and that nonviolence is “the law of our species.” As we’ve noted, this is an awareness latent in everyone, a natural human state, however temporarily obscured it may be by the fog of hatred. In principle, we should be able to awaken this awareness in virtually anyone, given enough time and know-how. Once awake, such awareness automatically takes precedence over the “baser passions.”

#### Non-violence is a critical personal reaction to the violence of subject formation.

Butler 2009 (Judith [American Philosopher] "The Claim of Nonviolence" Frames of War: When is Life Grievable? London: Verso. pp. 165-185)

An ethical proscription against the waging of violence does not disavow or refuse that violence that may be at work in the production of the subject. In fact, to understand a call to non-violence, it is probably necessary to reverse the formulation altogether: when one is formed in violence (and here the "one" may be formed through national structures of bellicosity that take various tributary forms in civil and private life), and that formative action continues throughout one's life, an ethical quandary arises about how to live the violence of one's formative history, how to effect shifts and reversals in its iteration. Precisely because iterability evades every determinism, we are left with questions such as: How do I live the violence of my formation? How does it live on in me? How does it carry me, in spite of me, even as I carry it? And in the name of what new value can I reverse and contest it? In what sense can such violence be redirected, if it can? Precisely because iterability evades every voluntarism, I am not free to dispense with the history of my formation. I can only live on in the wake of this unwilled region of history, or, indeed, as its wake. Can one work with such formative violence against certain violent outcomes and thus undergo a shift in the iteration of violence? Perhaps the better word here is "aggression" or, less clinically, "rage," since my view is that non-violence, when and where it exists, involves an aggressive vigilance over aggression's tendency to emerge as violence. As such, non-violence is a struggle, forming one of the ethical tasks of clinical psychoanalysis and of the psychoanalytic critique of culture.

#### Natural empathy forces nonviolence to be the natural state of all humans.

Woon 2014 (Chih Yuan [Geopolitics Professor at the National University of Singapore], Precarious geopolitics and the possibilities of nonviolence, Progress in Human Geography, Vol. 38, pp. 663 [KD])

Indeed, once the generalized condition of precariousness and interdependency is being recognized, Butler suggests that it reveals one less as an individual sovereign subject than as a being bound up with others in inextricable and irreversible ways. This relational ontology is fundamental but falls short of explaining motivating factors for nonviolent actions. This is where emotions serve as an important prism in illuminating the different impetuses for people’s inclination towards nonviolence. Since everybody is equally vulnerable as a consequence of the interdependency that lies at the heart of being human, individuals who have been mired in violence will be inclined not to reproduce such violence and its associated emotional traumas toward others. In Butler’s (2009: 181) words, ‘the desire to commit violence is always attended by the anxiety of having the violence returned’ since all potential actors in the scene are similarly susceptible to being hurt. Conversely, the ontological condition of shared vulnerability could also imply that people’s embodied experiences of pain and grief can function as a source of empathy for them not to inflict such equivalent suffering on fellow human beings. Hence, Butler’s works challenge us to broaden inquiries into how the affective consequences of violence can be transformed and reformulated into other emotional templates and practices for the augmenting of nonviolence. What this signifies is that, just as violence can be constituted through emotions (as the literature on emotional geopolitics has skilfully demonstrated), the possibility also arises for the channelling of such sentiments into materializing nonviolent commitments. Differentiating the two, then, requires careful dissection of their ontological assumptions about the value of lives: while the emotional injunction towards nonviolence is predicated on the precarious nature of existence, the emotive infrastructure of violence draws relevance from the powers that insist vulnerability and injurability can be monopolized at one site and fully refused at another.

### Historical Examples of Nonviolence

#### The Iranian Revolution was an example of non-violent revolution.

Zunes, Stephen (April 2009) https://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/iranian-revolution-1977-1979/

The Iranian Revolution of 1977-79 was the first in a series of mass popular civil insurrections which would result in the overthrow of authoritarian regimes in dozens of countries over the next three decades. Unlike most of the other uprisings that would topple dictators in Latin America, Eastern Europe, and parts of Asia and Africa, the result of the Iranian struggle was not the establishment of liberal democracy but of a new form of authoritarianism. However, except for a series of short battles using light weaponry in the final hours of the uprising, the revolutionary forces themselves were overwhelmingly nonviolent. The autocratic monarchy of Mohammed Reza Shah Pahlavi faced a broad coalition of opposition forces, including Marxists and constitutional liberals, but the opposition ultimately became dominated by the mullahs of the country’s Shia hierarchy. Despite severe repression against protestors, a series of demonstrations and strikes over the previous two years came to a peak in the fall of 1978, as millions of opponents of the Shah’s regime clogged the streets of Iran’s cities and work stoppages paralyzed the country. The Shah fled into exile in January 1979 and exiled cleric Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini returned from exile to lead the new Islamic Republic.

#### Black Lives Matter movement is frequently mislabeled.

The Economist 17. “The Misplaced Arguments against Black Lives Matter.” The Economist, The Economist Newspaper, 18 Aug. 2017, [www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2017/08/18/the-misplaced-arguments-against-black-lives-matter](http://www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2017/08/18/the-misplaced-arguments-against-black-lives-matter).

“ON AUGUST 15th Donald Trump repeated his belief that “both sides” were to blame for the violence on August 12th at a white-supremacist rally in Charlottesville, Virginia that left one woman dead. David Duke, a former leader of the Ku Klux Klan, thanked him for “condemn[ing] the leftist terrorists in BLM,” referring to the Black Lives Matter movement. David Clarke, the sheriff of Milwaukee County and a supporter of Mr Trump, has also called Black Lives Matter “purveyors of hate”, and urged the Southern Poverty Law Centre (SPLC), to include it among the hate groups it monitors. Many on the right share this belief. It is mistaken. To be sure, some protestors who claim affiliation with BLM have said hateful things. A group outside the Minnesota State Fair chanted, “Pigs in a blanket; fry ‘em like bacon”. The previous night a sheriff’s deputy had been shot in Houston, for which some BLM opponents blame the movement—without evidence. Some have blamed BLM for the fatal car crash in Charlottesville last weekend, saying it happened because BLM supporters were throwing bricks at the car. The movement may have begun with honourable intentions, one argument runs, but it has been “hijacked by a group that hates white people and looks to burn down cities and towns”. And some seem to object to the name, hearing in the phrase “Black lives matter” the implication that other lives do not.” That argument is easily dismissed. Affirming one thing does not negate all else. Donating money to support, say, cancer research does not make one a cheerleader for tuberculosis. Someone who says that black lives matter does not imply that other lives do not—they are simply reminding people that for most of American history black lives have been valued less than white ones. The days of slavery and de jure segregation have mercifully passed, but black Americans remain poorer, less healthy and more likely to be killed by police than whites. You can agree or disagree with BLM’s platform, but nothing in it promotes hatred of any race or group.Richard Cohen, who heads the SPLC, defines hate groups as “those that vilify entire groups of people based on immutable characteristics such as race or ethnicity”. BLM does not fit the bill: it welcomes white supporters, has condemned violence and addresses structural racial inequities. Jacob Levy, a political philosopher, argues that BLM is “one of the most significant political mobilisations in defence of freedom” in decades. Its supporters oppose police brutality, mass incarceration, America’s drug war, police militarisation and civil-forfeiture abuses. All of those are causes that liberals, libertarians and conservatives—anyone who fears unchecked state power—ought to cheer.”

#### Chile’s government was fixed by nonviolent action after violent action failed

Lakey ’12 (George Lakey; co-founder of the Earth Quaker Action Group, college professor, led 1,500 workshops on five continents, activist on local, national, and international levels, author, his first arrest was for a civil rights sit-in and most recent was with Earth Quaker Action Team while protesting mountain top removal coal mining, “The More Violence, The Less Revolution,” 3/6/12, https://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/the-more-violence-the-less-revolution/) [accessed 7/17/18 AT]

In the early 1970s, the United States got worried about Chile’s democratically-elected government led by left-leaning Salvador Allende. By 1973 the CIA joined the Chilean military to throw Allende out and install General Augusto Pinochet in his place. An armed struggle then developed against Pinochet’s military dictatorship, but it was unable to expel him. Researchers Shandra Bernath-Plaistad and Max Rennebohm describe what worked: a nonviolent people’s struggle succeeded in ousting Pinochet in 1988. The movement succeeded even though Pinochet used the existence of the Chilean armed struggle as a justification to use violence against the nonviolent campaign. It says a lot about people’s flexibility that, even after losing lives in a violent struggle for change, they can be pragmatic and switch to something that works better. There is more and more evidence that, other things being equal, nonviolent action is more powerful than violent action.

#### Women's’ Suffrage was largely achieved using nonviolent means.

Costain, Anne N. 2000 (Professor Costain received her Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University, and is a professor of Political Science at the University of Colorado Boulder. “Women's Movements and Nonviolence.” PS: Political Science and Politics, vol. 33, no. 2, June 2000, pp. 175–180. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/420887.pdf?refreqid=excelsior:0f7a3dc663e6ba692dc3a881b2410c58.). CM

The ties between women's rights movements and nonviolence have been deep and enduring. In the United States, they stretch from tactics employed by suffragists and proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) through core beliefs espoused by participants in these movements. The American movement for women's suffrage emerged out of a historic meeting in upstate New York. Five Quaker women, including Lucretia Mott and fellow abolitionist and women's rights advocate, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, gathered in Waterloo, where they agreed to call together a convention in Seneca Falls, New York, to discuss "the social, civil and religious rights of women” (quoted in Flexner 1973, 74). Held in 1848, this convention ended with the issuance of a "Declaration of Sentiments" and a by Anne N. Costain, University of Colorado, Boulder resolution supporting suffrage for women. These actions set the women's movement's agenda for the next seven decades. The authors of the declaration cataloged the exclusion of women from higher education, professions, and the ministry and asked that women be accorded all the "rights and immunities of citizens" granted by the U.S. Constitution. Since much of the leadership of the new movement was provided by Quaker women, including Susan B. Anthony, who became the best known of all suffrage champions, and Quaker faith and practice hold as central tenets both the rejection of violent conflict and the use of nonviolent means to oppose inequality, it is not surprising that the suffrage movement was advanced using tactics of active resistance. Accordingly, suffragists picketed and chained themselves to the fence of the White House, held hunger strikes, and organized massive marches of supporters and sympathizers

### Nonviolence IS NOT Pacifism

#### Nonviolence is distinct from pacifism, and has been successful in the past.

Howes 2013 (Dustin Ells [David J. Kriskovich Professor of Political Science at Louisiana State University] "The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence" Perspectives on Politics 11.2 (June 2013): 427-426.)

For the most part, disputes about violence in modern political theory center around when violence is necessary, but most agree that physical violence is necessary and good on some occasions.5 Pacifism has a long and distinguished intellectual heritage but I argue that, in broad strokes, Weber’s view has prevailed. As I will show below, pacifist arguments have failed to persuade most of the publics of the world. Most people believe physical violence is part and parcel of legitimate political orders. However, pacifist thinkers have played a critical role in developing a set of political practices that have spread widely, become greater in frequency, and are increasingly more effective than the violent alternatives. Nonviolence, while springing from pacifist thought, refers to a distinctive set of political practices that do not require actors to adopt pacifism. A growing body of empirical literature demonstrates that nonviolence is more effective than violence in a wide variety of circumstances. At the same time, research on violence and war shows that even as horrors of human conflict continue, our propensity for self-inflicted destruction is generally in decline. In addition, the traditional material factors thought to determine military success do not hold up under scrutiny. Bolstering recent empirical work on civil resistance and violence, epochal and unprecedented political achievements have also been won largely through nonviolence, including the legal abolition of slavery and the entry of women into politics. Even as pacifism as an ideology has failed to convince the publics of the world, a wide range of evidence points to the increasing success of nonviolence and the decreasing success and frequency of physical violence. These findings have led to a striking convergence in recent research among political scientists, sociologists, and political theorists, who explain both the limits of violence and the power of nonviolence. In what follows, I expand upon and develop the distinction between pacifism and nonviolence to outline and offer a preliminary defense of a new form of pacifism that I call pragmatic pacifism

#### Nonviolence is seperate from pacifism

Howes 2013 (Dustin Ells [David J. Kriskovich Professor of Political Science at Louisiana State University] "The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence" Perspectives on Politics 11.2 (June 2013): 427-426.)

However, pacifist thinkers have played a critical role in developing a set of political practices that have spread widely, become greater in frequency, and are increasingly more effective than the violent alternatives. Nonviolence, while springing from pacifist thought, refers to a distinc- tive set of political practices that do not require actors to adopt pacifism. A growing body of empirical literature demonstrates that nonviolence is more effective than vio- lence in a wide variety of circumstances. At the same time, research on violence and war shows that even as horrors of human conflict continue, our propensity for self-inflicted destruction is generally in decline. In addition, the tradi- tional material factors thought to determine military suc- cess do not hold up under scrutiny. Bolstering recent empirical work on civil resistance and violence, epochal and unprecedented political achievements have also been won largely through nonviolence, including the legal abo- lition of slavery and the entry of women into politics. Even as pacifism as an ideology has failed to convince the publics of the world, a wide range of evidence points to the increasing success of nonviolence and the decreasing success and frequency of physical violence. These findings have led to a striking convergence in recent research among political scientists, sociologists, and political theorists, who explain both the limits of violence and the power of nonviolence.

#### Pacifism does not work

Howes 2013 (Dustin Ells [David J. Kriskovich Professor of Political Science at Louisiana State University] "The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence" Perspectives on Politics 11.2 (June 2013): 427-426.)

Although pacifism and nonviolence bear a close relationship to one another historically, pacifism is the ideological assertion that war and violence should be rejected in political and personal life, whereas nonviolence refers to a distinct set of political practices. Unlike other modern ideologies such as liberalism and socialism, pacifism has never gained widespread acceptance among a significant portion of humanity and seems to remain a minority position among most of the peoples of the world. Even among those who use nonviolent techniques, the conventional wisdom that physical violence is necessary under certain circumstances often prevails. However, a growing body of empirical evidence shows that the methods of nonviolence are more likely to succeed than methods of violence across a wide variety of circumstances and that more people are using nonviolence around the world. At the same time, both the effectiveness of military and material superiority in achieving political ends and the incidence of warfare and violence appear to be waning. In a remarkable example of convergence between empirical social science and political theory, explanations for the effectiveness of nonviolence relative to violence point to a people-centered understanding of power. This research can provide a basis for a reinvigorated and pragmatic brand of pacifism that refocuses the attention of political scientists on the organization, actions, and loyalties of people as opposed to technologies of domination and destruction

### A2 Churchill’s “Business as Usual”

#### Nonviolence is the natural third option between violence and inaction.

Nagler 2014 (Michael N. [American Academic and Peace Activist, Professor Emeritus of University of California-Berkeley] "Introduction to Nonviolence" The Nonviolence Handbook: A Guide for Practical Action. pp. 4-5 [KD])

If we are unaware of nonviolence, we will tend to believe that our only response to an attack is to give in or to fight back—the fight-or-flight response. From the perspective of nonviolence, this is really no choice at all. Either approach—passively allowing violence to be used against us (or, for that matter, someone else) or reacting in kind—will only serve to increase the violence. Our real choice is not between these two expressions of violence; instead, it’s the choice that opens when we don’t want to take either approach. Then we want to confront violence with an alternative, with what Andrew Young, citing an old spiritual, called a “way out of no way.” Nonviolence offers us a viable, natural third way out of the fight-or-flight conundrum. The twentieth century discoveries of relativity and quantum reality showed us that nothing is as separate as it seems. Similarly, there is now a good deal of evidence that empathy and cooperation are in fact the dominant forces in evolution, that human beings and other primates are equipped with “mirror neurons” that enable us to share what another is feeling, that self-sacrifi ce can produce intense rewards in the nervous system—and, of course, that nonviolence is an extremely effective tool for social change.