## War Rhetoric

#### **the rhetoric we use to describe our political strategies is incredibly important. Regardless of intentions, the language surrounding politics has effects that are beyond our control. The affirmative is the latest in a long trend of the use of militarized rhetoric in our everyday lives. the affirmative describes the educational space of this debate as a warzone. To declare “war” on debate is to energize a violent frenzy that creates oppositional politics based on hatred and enemy creation.**

Stuart 11 – prof of law @ Valparaiso

(Susan, War As Metaphor And The Rule Of Law In Crisis: The Lessons We Should Have Learned From The War On Drugs, Southern Illinois University Law Journal, Vol. 36)

Rhetoric has long been employed to persuade, even goad, people to action. Speakers use powerful words and images to persuade people to sell a product, to vote for a candidate, to encourage collective action, to propagandize a political message, or to follow a religious creed. Rhetoric is fundamental to the movement of people, to the indoctrination of the crowd. Powerful rhetoric indeed was required to persuade a reluctant and loosely affiliated group of colonists to rebel against the most powerful country on earth to form a union of states that would protect the right to engage in that rhetoric. However, the problem posed by much of today’s rhetoric—on both sides of the political spectrum although primarily on the right3—is that public policy discussions are no longer couched in the pragmatic rhetoric concerning the merits of ideas or solutions to problems facing the country. Instead, that rhetoric is couched in terms of war.¶ Such militaristic rhetoric has become increasingly common in advancing public policy agendas, perhaps most notably evolving with Cold War rhetoric in foreign policy.4 More troubling has become the use of war rhetoric “to elicit public consent for all sorts of disparate ventures.”5 For instance, President Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty was waged in the 1960s to gain support for sweeping civil rights reforms. The Cold War eventually resolved itself with the collapse of the Soviet Union, while the War on Poverty effected significant civil rights legislation. Both so-called wars, not real wars but causes deemed to be just, were resolved favorably to the United States and thereby confirmed the efficacy of militaristic rhetoric. At the time, therefore, the use of such rhetoric seemed justified, not problematic. World War II was the very recent past, and we assumed the public understood the distinction between the rhetoric’s metaphorical use in public policy positions and its literal use. We were, after all, still engaged in actual military operations in Korea and Vietnam during the 1950s and 1960s. We thought we recognized that militaristic rhetoric was a marketing ploy (pathos) to sell the logic of foreign policy and of social policy (logos). Especially with regard to social policy, we recognized that the militarized rhetoric was a metaphor for the struggle with an abstraction—civil rights and poverty. Although violence was an unfortunate outgrowth of the civil rights movement, President Johnson’s rhetoric was not a declaration of war against a literal enemy. However, today’s increasing use of militaristic rhetoric by politicians and pundits goes beyond its metaphorical use as a war against an abstraction. Instead, the use of such language is becoming literal, and that rhetorical shift matters. Today’s militaristic rhetoric is increasingly identifying fellow citizens as enemies in a literal war. The homology of literal war rhetoric and metaphorical war rhetoric arises from a potent source. In the modern United States, military images have extraordinary persuasive value:¶ Collective memory of war, more than any other genre of historical experience, has been central to the public culture of the modern United States as well as to the commercial realm of historical memory. Popular memories of war not only claim to preserve some heroic moment of the past, but they often make acute demands upon the living, who must periodically show themselves worthy of the gifts bestowed upon them by the wartime sacrifices of others.6¶ At some point, however, we have crossed the line from the marketing use of the metaphorical militarization to actual militarization. Somewhere in the last thirty or forty years, we have found it too easy to use militarized rhetoric without examining its consequences. Nowhere is that easy usage more apparent than in the War on Drugs, especially as it relates to children. What happened to children in the War on Drugs may even be part of the reason why our current public discourse is reaching a crisis point: A war against an abstraction found an enemy—a defenseless enemy—and fundamentally changed the rule of law to make engaging that enemy much easier.¶ At its inception, the War on Drugs had a public policy logos to market by its military pathos: The United States had a problem dealing with drug abuse when the War was declared. Hence, the War did not start as an end in and of itself. It was merely the means to curbing an abstract problem, not unlike the War on Poverty. Its militarized rhetoric did not start out as anything but a rhetorical ploy in changing public perception and therefore public policy. From the successes of that marketing strategy has emerged the new militarized rhetoric that has moved the metaphorical to the literal. Unfortunately, these renewed strategies seem utterly oblivious to the consequences of the abysmal failure that is the War on Drugs. Furthermore, the rhetoric of the War on Drugs has inured us to the moral implications of using such rhetoric and the personal responsibility that should go with it. Without that moral awareness, the new militarized rhetoric is much more dangerous as it becomes less metaphorical and more literal.¶ Thus, the thesis of this article is that the larger marketing strategy of public policy through militarized rhetoric does have consequences because, ultimately, a specific enemy may be engaged and war-time exigencies may suspend the rule of law. Worse, we may have changed our schools into institutions where we teach children that militarized rhetoric is acceptable and without moral consequence. Part I describes the militarization of the War on Drugs and how and why the U.S. government’s marketing strategy was first employed. Turning schools into literal battlegrounds in the War on Drugs is the subject of Part II. That analysis will examine how all three branches of government actually enabled the War on Drugs by both identifying children as enemies and legally justifying the war against them. Part III then explores the “Americanization” philosophy of the War, a philosophy that has not only contributed to the longevity of the War and turned public schoolchildren into the enemy but also acted as the abstraction that formed the basis of today's militarized rhetoric in the Culture War by painting the War as an “us-versus-them”-style struggle. Part IV then identifies the War on Drugs as one of the direct sources of today’s hyper-militarized rhetoric in which war is both the means and the end of the marketing strategy and opines that that War deafened Americans to the moral implications of war as metaphor so that we now do have actual war among citizens of this country, the consequence of which may be a fundamental change in the rule of law.

#### **The affirmative’s militarized rhetoric not only creates enemies and violent politics, it also actively papers over the real violence of militarism. To even begin to compare an academic discussion to the death and destruction of rifles, bombs, and missiles is a rhetorical strategy that actively numbs us to violence, as we accept more and more casual use of the term “war.”**

Stuart 11 – prof of law @ Valparaiso

(Susan, War As Metaphor And The Rule Of Law In Crisis: The Lessons We Should Have Learned From The War On Drugs, Southern Illinois University Law Journal, Vol. 36)

Politicians and pundits have become immune to the ethics of war rhetoric. The rhetoric itself is violent, and it breeds violence. The forty years of the War on Drugs has demonstrated the success of militarized rhetoric to move this nation to action. It does not suggest the success of the war itself, but it demonstrated the power of the marketing tool. It allows pundits and politicians to avoid responsibility by saying: “Everybody does it.” The War on Drugs has damaged the American culture and it has damaged its democratic genius, the rule of law. But ultimately, it has made acceptable the idea of being at war with each other.¶ As the parable of the War on Drugs has taught the people of this nation, we will target specific enemies in the cause of an abstraction when impelled by metaphorical militarized rhetoric. Those enemies will not be protected by our rule of law. As these abstractions become less connected to facts and pragmatism, metaphorical rhetoric acquires the tenor of actual call to arms. The subtleties of the distinctions—even if those distinctions exist—are lost on the crowd that no longer recognizes the moral implications of war. Left to its own devices to preserve itself, the crowd will select enemies at random, targeting anybody who is not “us” to preserve itself. Gabrielle Giffords was specifically targeted in this Culture War. One can hardly argue that her shooting was coincidence or that mental instability is an intervening cause. Today’s pundits and politicians no longer have the moral sense to even see the connection. Maybe that blindness is the most horrifying result of the numbness we suffer from the forty-year drumbeat of the War on Drugs: “Regardless of how you try to explain to people it’s a ‘war on drugs’ or a ‘war on a product,’ people see a war as a war on them. . . . We’re not at war with people in this country.”231¶ During its ill-conceived and badly implemented forty-year life, the War on Drugs has made victims of Americans' self-respect, their sense of democracy, and their children. As originally marketed, this War would rid the nation's schools of drugs and drug users, thereby helping schools get back to what they are designed to do—educate children. No one doubts or could credibly argue that drug use and schools do not mix. The problems with the War on Drugs were early apparent, making its longevity somewhat of a mystery. However, our ability to embrace war as the solution to a social policy and to ignore the moral ambiguities caused by such solution arose from the casual way in which we accept militarized rhetoric as the appropriate frame for the problem. In so accepting that pathos, we allowed our government to actually engage an enemy who could not fight back and to turn their safe haven into a war zone. If we allow our own children to be targeted, what stops people from declaring war on Members of Congress?

#### **Rhetoric really important**

Sanchez 13 – jd candidate @ Yale Law

(Andrea Nill, Mexico’s Drug “War”: Drawing a Line Between Rhetoric and Reality, THE YALE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol. 38: 467)

Outside of legal academia, the late Wayne C. Booth—who dedicated his life to analyzing rhetoric—similarly pointed out that war rhetoric is essentially the most influential form of political rhetoric that “makes (and destroys) our realities.”64 This is because political rhetoric is inherently aimed at changing present circumstances.65 Linguist George Lakoff and philosopher Mark Johnson have maintained that our conceptual system itself is metaphorical and that metaphors thus “structure how we perceive, how we think, and what we do.”66 Citing the rhetorical use of the term “war,” they note that the very acceptance of the war metaphor leads to certain inferences and also clears the way for political action.67 Thus, the examples that follow in this section should not be merely dismissed as insignificant rhetorical flourishes. As Lackoff and Johnson warn,¶ Metaphors may create realities for us, especially social realities. A metaphor may thus be a guide for future action. Such actions, will of course, fit the metaphor. This will, in turn, reinforce the power of the metaphor to make experience coherent. In this sense metaphors can be self-fulfilling prophecies.68

## hooks

#### The affirmative relies on binary thinking that blames the actions of others for suffering

#### This ensures the failure of resistance and develops a culture of victimization that recreates imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy which is the foundation of all oppression

Hooks 12, Distinguished Professor in Residence at Barea

(Bell, Writing Beyond Race: Living Theory and Practice, pg. 43)

Clearly the future of diversity lies in creating greater awareness and greater critical consciousness about the importance of ending domination, of challenging and changing white supremacy. Riane Eisler urges in her partnership model that we shift from an us-versus-them attitude to a worldview where we place the “same standards of human rights and responsibilities provided by the partnership model to all cultures.” She contends: “In a world where technologies of communication and destruction span the globe almost instantaneously, creating a better world is a matter of enlightened self-interest.” Now more than ever we need to create learning communities that make learning the theory and practice of diversity essential aspects of curriculum. In my recent book Teaching Critical Thinking: Practical Wisdom, I call attention to the way in which issues of diversity both inside and outside the classroom are slowly being pushed back into the realm of silence and misinformation. As I wrote: “More than ever before, students need to learn from unbiased perspectives, be they conservative or radical. More than ever before, students and teachers need to fully understand differences of nationality, race, sex, class, and sexuality if we are to create ways of knowing that reinforce education as the practice of freedom.” Learning to challenge and change binary thinking – the us-and-them paradigm – is one way to create a foundation that can be sustained. Holding onto binary thinking actually keeps dominator culture in place, for one aspect of that culture is the projection outward onto an enemy, an “other,” whenever things go wrong, and this casting of blame in turns helps to promote a culture of vicitimization. When we are more energized by the practice of blaming then we are by efforts to create transformation, we not only cannot find relief from suffering, we are creating the conditions that help keep us stuck in the status quo. Our attachment to blaming, to identifying the oppressor stems from the fear that if we cannot unequivocally and absolutely state who the enemy is then we cannot know how to organize resistance struggle. In the insightful book Ruling Your World: Ancient Strategies for Modern Life, Mipham Rinpoche talks about learning to understand others rather than blaming them. He shares: “I remember my father and other of the older generation of Tibetan lamas saying that they did not blame the Communist Chinese for the destruction of Tibet. They felt that blaming the Chinese would not solve anything. It would only trap Tibetans in the past.” Similarly, any critical examination of the history of the civil rights struggle in the United States will show that greater progress was made when leaders emphasized the importance of forgiving one’s enemies, working for reconciliation and the formation of a beloved community, rather than angry retaliation. Casting blame and calling for vengeance was an aspect of militant movements for black power that have really failed to sustain the climate of unlearning racism previously forged by nonviolent anti-racist struggle. In the aftermath of sixties rebellion, the more black folks were encouraged to vent rage, to “blame” all white folks for race-based exploitation and domination, and to eschew any notion of forgiveness, the more an internalized sense of victimhood became the norm. Tragically, today many black folks are more despairing of any possibility that racism can be effectively challenged and changed than at other similar historical moments when white supremacist aggression was more overtly life threatening. Unenlightened white folks who proclaim either that racism has ended or that they are not responsible for slavery engage in a politics of blame wherin they disavow political reality to insist that black folk are never really victims of racism but are the agents of their own suffering. Dualistic thinking, which is at the core of dominator thinking, teaches people that there is always the oppressed and the oppressor, a victim and a victimizer. Hence there is always someone to blame. Moving past the ideology of blame to a politics of accountability is a difficult move to make in a society where almost all political organizing, whether conservative or radical, has been structured around the binary of good guys and bad guys. Accountability is a much more complex issue. A politics of blame allows a contemporary white person to make statements like, “My family never owned slaves,” or “Slavery is over. Why can’t they just get over it?” In contrast, a politics of accountability would emphasize that all white people benefit from the privileges accrued from racist exploitation past and present and therefore are accountable for changing and transforming white supremacy and racism. Accountability is a more expansive concept because it opens a field of possibility where in we are all compelled to move beyond blame to see where our responsibility lies. Seeing clearly that we live within a dominator culture of imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy, I am compelled to locate where my responsibility lies. In some circumstances I am in a position to be a victimizer. If I only lay claim to those aspects of the system where I define myself as the oppressed and someone else as my oppressor then I continually fail to see the larger picture. Any effort I might make to challenge domination is likely to fail if I am not looking accurately at the circumstances that create suffering, and thus seeing the larger picture. After more than thirty years of talking to folks about domination, I can testify that masses of folks in our society – both black and white – resist seeing the larger picture.

#### The affirmative’s focus on whiteness and white privilege trades off with struggles against white supremacist thinking which are the foundation for persistent structural harms of racism

Hooks 12, Distinguished Professor in Residence at Barea

(Bell, Writing Beyond Race: Living Theory and Practice, pg. 6)

When I speak with audiences about imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy, the one piece of these interlocking political systems that individuals most resist acknowledging is white supremacy. And yet if we cannot as a culture accept the way white supremacist thinking and practice informs some aspect of our lives irrespective of skin color, then we will never move beyond race. Unlike race and racism, which does not overly harm masses of folk in ways that causes direct damage, white supremacy is the covert ideology that is the silent cause of harm and trauma. Think of the black children, both rich and poor, who watch long hours of television that imprints their young minds with the notion that white is good and black is bad. All over the United States, parents who assume they have taught their families to be actively anti-racist are shocked when they discover that their children harbor intense anti-black feelings. This is just one example. Another example might be the interracial couple in which the white individual proclaims their undying love for a black partner but then in conversations talks about their belief that black people are intellectually inferior. This is not an expression of conventional racial prejudice. It does however remind us that one can be intimate with black folks, claim even to love us, and yet still hold white supremacist attitudes about the nature of black identity. Thinking about white supremacy as the foundation of race and racism is crucial because it allows us to see beyond skin color. It allows us to look at all the myriad ways our daily actions can be imbued by white supremacist thinking no matter our race. Certainly, race and racism will never become unimportant if we cannot recognize the need to consistently challenge white supremacy. When cultural studies emerged as a context where the issues of whiteness and white privilege could be studied and theorized, it appeared that a new way of thinking and talking about race was emerging. Even though scholars wrote much about white privilege, they did not always endeavor to show the link between underlying notions of white supremacy and white privilege. Overracialising whiteness then made it seem as though white skin and the privileges that it allows were the primary issues, and not the white supremacist ways of thinking and acting that are expressed by folks of all skin colors. It may very well be that the re-centering of whiteness has helped silence the necessary theories and practice that are needed if we are as a nation to truly learn how to be rid of racism.

#### Conceptualizing the struggle for racial justice as resisting the oppression of black people by whites prevents reformation of white supremacist thinking which is the only way to effectively challenge racism

Hooks 12, Distinguished Professor in Residence at Barea

(Bell, Writing Beyond Race: Living Theory and Practice, pg. 23)

As long as this nation absolutely refuses to accurately name white supremacy then the roots of racism will remain strong. Ironically, even though feminist theory and cultural criticism have led to the study of whiteness and white privilege, very little of this work addresses the issue of white supremacy. When we engage a discourse that focuses on white supremacy it enables us to see ways individuals who gain no “privilege” by allegiance to white supremacist thought and action collude in the perpetuation and maintenance of this system. Here is another common racialized scenario involving children: a white girl child born blonde is constantly told by everyone she comes into contact with how beautiful she is and therefore worthy of more attention and regard than those considered less attractive. However, as the child ages, her hair begins to darken and as a consequence she is no longer the recipient of the hyper-regard shown to her as a blonde. Increasingly, she feels invisible; in some cases should would rather die than not continue her life as a blonde. Like her darker counterpart who seeks to lighten her skin with toxic bleaching cleaners, this little girl has learned that in a white supremacist context lighter is always better. In her book It’s The Little Things: Everyday Interactions That Anger, Annoy, and Divide the Races, African American journalist Lena Williams tells the story of a high-powered black friend who had purchased a house where the kitchen floor was decorated with old movie posters. Living with these images she was surprised when her four-year-old daughter announced: “Mommy, I don’t want to be black…Nobody likes black people!” Her evidence of this included the fact that there were no images of black folks in the movie posters. Her mother was astonished by this: “I hadn’t noticed that only white people were in the posters, but here was my four-year-old child – whose mommy was a lawyer and daddy a doctor – getting this message.” Williams includes this story in a chapter that discusses the way all the images that surround us, even though they may appear to be benign, often reveal the degree to which our lives are governed by an underlying ethic of white supremacy. In the growing body of critical work on whiteness there is more writing than ever before about race and aesthetics. Work that looks at the way in which the politics of white supremacy creates an aesthetic where the color and texture of hair determines value, setting standards where lighter, straighter, and longer hair equates with beauty and desirability. New work on hair like the book Big Hair informs us that only a small population of white people in the United States are born blonde and that the sad reality is that personal aesthetics rooted in white supremacist thinking can lead large numbers of white females to dye their hair blonde from their teens into adulthood. Nowadays there are segregated hair salons that specifically cater to white females desiring to be always and only blonde. Browsing any contemporary fashion magazine one sees that blondes predominate; they set the standards for what is deemed truly beautiful. While there is an ongoing discussion about the way in which white supremacist-based color caste systems create trauma in black lives, there is little discussion of the way in which these same standards create distress and trauma for white folks. Moviegoers can see a film like Chris Rock’s Good Hair and marvel at the torture and painful self-mutilation black females undergo to look “white” but do not document the torture white females face when they strive to acquire the right really white look. Even though everyone in this society is inundated with white supremacist aesthetics and will remain its victim unless we consciously choose against it, we are still encouraged to consider the issue of race as primarily a matter of black and white. Certainly it serves the serves the interest of dominator culture to promote a shallow understanding of race politics that consistently makes it appear that the issues of race in the United States solely rest on the status of darker skinned people. It may well be that the growing Hispanic population (which too is invested heavily in white supremacist aesthetics) will help push the discourse of race past issues of black and white and toward the issue of white supremacist thought and action. Every black person who talks about race has an experience where they have been interrogated about their focus on issues of black and white. Rarely does a person of color who is non-black acknowledge that the most intense forms of racial assault and discrimination in our nation have been directed primarily at black people. Professing this understanding and allegiance with black anti-racist struggles would do more to affirm challenges to white supremacy than competing for the status of who will receive more attention. The fact is when black people receive that greater attention from the dominant white society it is usually negative. Despite gains in civil rights a huge majority of white Americans and some non-black people of color continue to believe that black people are less intelligent, full of rage, and more likely to express anger with violence than all other groups. Even though negative racist stereotypes about Asian identities abound, there is no overwhelming consensus on the part of white Americans that they are incapable of intelligent rational thought. It is troubling that so many of the hateful negative stereotypes the dominant culture uses to characterize black identity are endorsed by non-black people of color. Their endorsement is an expression of collusion and solidarity with white supremacist thought and action. If all people of color and even our white allies in struggle were decolonizing their minds, challenging and changing white supremacy, they could see value in identification with blackness rather than feeling there must always be competition over who will receive the most attention from white folks. They would see clearly that the system of domination that remains oppressive and exploitative is ever ready to recruit and train as many black, brown, red, and yellow people are are needed to maintain the status quo. A thorough understanding of the complex dynamic of white supremacist thought and action would provide all citizens with a way to understand why this nation can elect a black man to be its leader and yet resist any system-wide efforts, both public and private, to challenge and change racial inequality. From the moment he entered the oval office, Obama’s actions have been continually subject to policing to ensure he does act in any way that brings particular benefits to African American citizens. Sadly, even though there have been wonderful advances in anti-discrimination-based civil rights laws and public agendas, there has been no profound effort to destroy the roots of racism. Instead we live in a society that claims via our government and public policy to condemn racial discrimination even as imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy shapes our politics and culture. Even though we have a racially integrated workforce, however relative that may be, one wherein white folks and folks of color share common ground, working together without overt strife, individuals rarely meet outside the workforce and a veneer of peace is the norm. White folks and people of color continue to negatively assess one another even though their actual lived experience of interracial connection should provide cause for them to interrogate false beliefs and assumptions. One of the sad ironies of racism in the United States is that so many black people/people of color unwittingly collude in the perpetuation of white supremacy while denouncing racism and actively speaking out against racial injustice. Most black people/people of color rarely raise the issue of white supremacy even though the values it promotes are internalized by almost everyone. Throughout the nation’s history most racialized civil rights struggle has focused on the exploitation and oppression of black people by whites. And even though more militant anti-racist struggle, like the movement for black power, called attention to internalized racism, this awareness did not become the basis for a national restructuring of anti-racist political struggle. Instead, the issues that have been raised by a focus on internalized racism (color caste hierarchies, low self-esteem, self-hatred, etc.) came to be regarded as more personal, and therefore more psychological and not truly political. During much of the militant black power movement anger and rage were the emotions anti-racist advocates fixated on as essential catalysts for liberation struggle. That highlighting of anger as a basis for resistance was far more appealing as an organizing tool than the issue of internalized racism or even a focus on self-determination.

#### Orienting resistance against imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy is a critical means of naming interlocking systems of oppression in which we are both victim and victimizer. This is critical to the creation of agency and the resistance of dominator thinking

Hooks 12, Distinguished Professor in Residence at Barea

(Bell, Writing Beyond Race: Living Theory and Practice, pg. 43)

When I first began to use the phrase imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy to characterize the interlocking systems that shape the dominator culture we live within, individuals would often tell me that they though it was just too harsh a phrase. In the past ten years, when I’ve used the phrase at lectures, more often than not audiences respond with laughter. Initially, I though this laughter was an expression of discomfort, that the true nature of our nation’s politics were being exposed. But as the laughter followed me from talk to talk I began to see it as a way to deflect attention away from the seriousness of this naming. Time and time again critical theory has taught us the power of naming accurately that which we are challenging and hoping to transform. But one way to silence accurate naming is to make it appear ridiculous, too strident, too harsh. Rarely am I asked the value of calling attention to interlocking systems of domination. Yet when we examine the cultural circumstances that provided the groundwork for facscism in the twentieth century (looking particularly at the roots of fascism in Germany, Spain, and Italy), we find similar traits in our nation (i.e., patriarchial, nationalistic, racist, religious, economic power controlled by a minority in the interests of wealth, religion, etc.). In fascist regimes, teaching populations to fear “terrorism” is one way the system garners support. Concurrently, dissident voices challenging the status quo tend to be silenced by varied forms of censorship. Most recently in our nation, the use of media to suggest that anyone who criticizes government is a traitor deserving of condemnation and even arrest effectively silences many voices. Meaningful resistance to dominator culture demands of all of us a willingness to accurately identify the various systems that work together to promote injustice, exploitation, and oppression. To name interlocking systems of domination is one way to disrupt our wrongminded reliance on dualistic thinking. Highlighted, these interlocking systems tend to indict us all in some way, making it impossible for any of us to claim that we are absolutely and always victims, calling attention to the reality of our accountability, however relative. When we are accountable, we eschew the role of victim and are able to claim the space of our individual and collective agency. For many folks, especially those who are suffering exploitation and/or oppression, that agency may seem inadequate. However, asserting agency, even in small ways, is always the first step in self-determination. It is the place of hope.

## Non-Violence

#### We believe that the goals are necessary, but don’t necessarily agree with their method

#### Only a foundational grounding in clear principles of nonviolence can facilitate a successful struggle for liberation. An approach that does not explicitly rule out violent tactics ensures an eventual move towards violence with counterproductive consequences

Domhoff 05, Professor of Sociology at UC Santa Cruz

(William, Social Movements and Strategic Nonviolence, www2.ucsc.edu/whorulesamerica/change/science\_nonviolence.html)

Despite the effectiveness of strategic nonviolence, complete adherence to it has been abandoned by some of the most visible and influential activists since the mid-1960s. This move toward the inclusion of violent acts in the repertoire of movement tactics began when Black Power advocates became increasingly impatient with the lack of responsiveness to plans for increasing political and economic integration after the Civil Rights Movement achieved its primary goals through the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. They were first deeply disappointed by the failure of the 1964 Democratic National Convention to seat the integrated delegation of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. That delegation was rejected, at the insistence of President Lyndon B. Johnson, except for two tokens, in favor of a racist delegation of tradition Southern Democrats who would not even pledge to support the Democratic nominee. It was truly a defining moment, a great divide between egalitarians and liberals within the Democratic Party on how to confront Southern white racists . Militant black activists also watched in despair as the conservative voting bloc continued to limit those kinds of government spending that might give African-Americans a chance to improve their economic position. Moreover, there was foot dragging and outright refusal by trade unions to integrate their apprenticeship programs. This situation suggested that the unionized white working class was not prepared to share good jobs with African-Americans, belying the support for civil rights by many union leaders. Nor was there any sign of a loosening in residential segregation, which meant among other things that African-Americans would not have access to the best public schools. For understandable but lamentable reasons, then, several top leaders in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee gave up on nonviolence and working with whites, creating conflict within the organization with those who wanted to continue as a nonviolent and integrated movement. Soon after, Black Power advocates won out in this argument, turning to inflammatory rhetoric about "taking up the gun" that threatened many whites and validated their worst fears. Black Power advocates then found allies in the North with the creation of the Black Panther Party, a self-identified revolutionary Marxist group, whose goals and armed confrontations with the police led to shoot outs and deaths in several cities. The Black Power stance of the Black Panthers and what remained of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee gave the movement for African-American equality and opportunity a violent and frightening image that alienated most whites. Feeling blocked on all sides, and doubting that whites would become any less prejudiced, many African-American communities exploded on their own, starting in south central Los Angeles in 1965, often in response to policy brutality, and with little or no prompting from Black Power advocates. These upheavals reached a peak in the extensive protests and property destruction in reaction to the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1968. Contrary to claims that they were aimless riots, they turned out to be more purposeful and targeted at specific businesses than was originally thought. Furthermore, there is reason to believe that jobs were created in response to these eruptions, and funding for existing government programs targeted at ghetto areas was increased. In the first few years after these long hot summers, it seemed like the uprisings had a pay-off, and therefore made some political sense. However, with the help of hindsight, a bigger fact needs to be faced: the long-term effects of the violence were negative. The outbursts were an understandable reaction to pent-up frustration and anger, and they had specific messages to deliver, but they were nonetheless a political mistake. The fact that they occurred shows the need for any future egalitarian movement to have its principles clear and in place before becoming involved in highly emotional events that are not easily understood or controlled as they unfold. It is not possible to spread the word about why violent disorders are not a good idea while they are happening. A new egalitarian movement would have to explain why they are unproductive well before they are on the horizon, not sit back and let them happen. For example, the gulf between blacks and whites expanded as the disruptions continued over several summers. Suspicion and anger were increased on both sides. Cities like Newark and Detroit still had not recovered from the withdrawal of investment 35 years later. "Law and order" became a code word for the enlargement of a criminal justice system that was used to control black communities. Some white voters in the North expressed their approval of a hard-line government approach by voting against the Democratic candidates for president in 1968 and 1972, helping to destroy the New Deal coalition in the process. Polls are also quite telling on the negative consequences of violence. While American public opinion gradually liberalized from the 1960s to the 1980s on a wide range of issues championed by egalitarian movements, such as women's rights, it went the other way on anything to do with violence and disorder. For example, from 1965 to 1969 there was a 26 percent rise in the percentage of people saying that courts were not harsh enough, bringing the total to 83 percent. Support for the death penalty declined from 73 percent in 1953 to 47 percent in 1965, but then jumped back up to 50 percent in 1966 and to 80 percent by 1980.

#### Violent resistance is intrinsically connected to violent masculinity and patriarchy. The move towards violence ensures resistance failure and subjugation of those seen as weak

Bartkowski 13, Senior Director at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict

(Maciej, Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles, pg. 339)

Changing entrenched views about the effectiveness of armed resistance is particularly hard as they are usually rooted in a warrior psychology that is shaped by violent masculinity and patriarchy. Struggles for independence typically have privileged male leadership. As a consequence, conspiracies of belligerent men plotting in small, secretive circles in an atmosphere that congratulates violent bravery and rewards machismo, leave little room for recognizing the importance of nonviolent alternatives or the contributions of women or non-fighting-age young men to the struggle. In fact, the discourse of hegemonic victors tends to conform to a masculinist construct that, as Jean Bethke Elshtain maintains, from antiquity though to the present has divided society into “just warriors” (male fighters and protectors) and “beautiful souls” (female victims and noncombatants). The circle of just warriors is also limited as it would normally exclude men who wanted to play other roles (i.e., gays) or their virility did not conform to the prevailing warrior achetype. Furthermore, teaching history, including the rise of nations, formation of state institutions, conduct of state politics, and development and implementation of public policies, shapes a nation’s commemorative landscape and punctuates it with stories of military battles, patriotic risings, wars and violent defeats – all dominated by men, be they soldiers, scholars, politicians, or other elite actors. This has inhibited people from remembering, acknowledging, and understanding the presence and efficacy of civil resistance, including the central place of women engaged in writing and distributing petitions; organizing and leading demonstrations and protests; setting up and running autonomous associations and educational institutions; and supporting and participating in social and economic boycotts, strikes and sit-ins. Masculinity and Civil Resistance. While armed struggle and violent masculinity are almost symbiotically joined in the historical imagination, the question of systemic male domination in civil resistance is more complex and ambiguous. Foreign occupation and colonization has frequently been based on economic exploitation and has often involved cultural genocide or extreme forms of coercion such as slavery, forced migration, resettlement, and conscription. Often a systematic part of foreign domination has been sexual exploitation of women and (as mentioned in Chapter 7 on Egypt) humiliation of indigenous men. In conditions where a foreign colonizer’s racist stereotypes affected both a symbolic and real emasculation, the oppressed population – particularly its men – often saw “regaining manhood” as a basic element of independence equivalent to self-respect or dignity. Becoming men is thus a common theme to be found in both armed and nonviolence anticolonial stuggles, as indeed in other struggles against other kinds of oppression.

#### Belief in the necessity of violent struggle to overcome oppression is not a neutral conception grounded in fact – it’s the result of an intentionally distorted history that privileges armed combat. The negative will offer case studies to disrupt the dominant narrative of glorious battle for freedom in order to open new productive paths that enable successful non-violent resistance.

Bartkowski 13, Senior Director at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict

(Maciej, Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles, pg. 1)

Most people look to historical accounts to understand how their own nations emerged and fought for their freedom. Such explanations, whether found in books or imparted though public ceremonies and national memories, often tell of violent battles and insurrections, victories and defeats in wars, and fallen heroes in armed struggles. These narratives support the common belief that violence is the indispensable weapon to win freedom from foreign subjugation, but they ignore the power and historical role that nonviolent civilian-led resistance has played in many national quests for liberation. This book brings to light the existence and impact of nonviolent organizing and defiance where it has not commonly been noticed. It argues that a number of historical struggles for national self-determination might not necessarily, or even primarily, have been won through violence. Instead, these struggles were decisively waged through diverse methods of nonviolent resistance led by ordinary people. Furthermore, during the unfolding process of civil resistance, it was often the force of population-driven, bottom-up, nonviolent mobilization that shaped nations’ collective identities (i.e., nationhood) and formed nascent national institutions and authorities (i.e., statehood). These processes were critical for an independent nation-state – more so than structural changes or violent revolutions that dominate the history of revolutionary struggles and nation making. Recovering Civil Resistance. This book reveals little-known, but important, histories of civil resistance in national struggles for independence and against foreign domination throughout the world in the past 200 years. Often, these histories have been misinterpreted or erased altogether from collective memory, buried beneath nationally eulogized violence, commemorative rituals of glorified death, martyred heroes, and romanticized violent insurrections. In recovering hidden stories of civil resistance that involve diverse types of direct defiance and more subtle forms of everyday, relentless endurance and refusal to submit, this book shows how the actions of ordinary people have undermined the authority and control of foreign hegemons – colonizers and occupiers – and their domestic surrogates. Despite extreme oppression, the repertoire of nonviolent action has often helped societies survive and strengthen their social and cultural fabric, build economic and political institutions, shape national identities, and pace the way to independence. The narrative of the book contains a heuristic inquiry into forgotten or ignored accounts of civil resistance, showing how knowledge about historical events and processes is generated, distorted, and even ideologized in favor of violence-driven, structure-based, or powerholder-centric interpretations. Glorified violence in the annals of nations, the gendered nature of violence wielded by men, state independence that is seen as having been founded largely on violence (the view reinforced by a state monopoly on violence as way to maintain that independence), and human attention and media focus (both centered on dramatic and spectacular stories of violence and heroic achievements of single individuals) all dim the light on the quiet, nonviolent resistance of millions. This type of struggle neither captures the headlines nor sinks into people’s memories unless it provokes the regime’s response and, more often that not, a violent one. The outcomes of seemingly violent struggles with foreign adversaries have depended to a large degree on the use of political – nonviolent – means rather than arms. Materially and militarily powerful empires and states have been defeated by poorly armed or even completely unarmed opponents not because they met irresistibly violent force, but because the nations found another source of strength – the total mobilization of the population via political, administrative, and ideological tools. Thus, political organizing has been the key ingredient in the people’s revolutions that have helped the militarily weaker successfully challenge powerful enemies. Examples include, among others, the Spanish insurrectionists against Napoleon, the Chinese revolutionaries against the Japanese Army, and the North Vietnamese against the United States and its South Vietnamese allies. In all of these supposedly violence-dominated conflicts, military tools were subordinated to a broader political struggle for the “hearts and minds” of ordinary people. By recovering the stories of nonviolent actions, this book goes against a tide of prevailing views about struggles against foreign domination that fail to recognize and take into account the role and contribution of civil resistance.

#### We present the following case studies in order to challenge dominant narratives that valorize armed struggle and dismiss the power of nonviolent resistance:

#### Ghana - nonviolent resistance was able to quickly and successfully overthrow imperialist repression

Bartkowski 13, Senior Director at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict

(Maciej, Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles, pg. 63)

The newly independent state of Ghana took a leading role in advocating and using civil resistance. In Deember 1958 independent Ghana hosted the All-African Peoples’ Conference, a follow-up to the 1945 Pan-African Congress. Patrice Lumumba and Tom Mboya were there along with a large Algerian contingent. In his opening speech, Nkrumah attributed the success of the Ghanaian independence movement to nonviolent positive action. Kojo Botsio, who led the CPP delegation, told countries still struggle for liberation that, “with the united will of the people behind you, the power of the imperialists can be destroyed without the use of violence.” Some delegations were unhappy with the emphasis on nonviolent resistance, especially the Algerians and Egyptians who “regarded the very word ‘nonviolence’ as an insult to brothers fighting and dying for freedom.” Ultimately, the congress declared its support for peaceful means in territories where democratic means were available but also supported those in circumstances where arms were the only protection from colonial violence. In 1959, after hearing that France planned to test nuclear weapons in the Sahara Desert at Regan, Algeria, a group of eleven Ghanaians along with British and other international activists attempted to intervene nonviolently, but were ejected from French territory in Upper Volta and ended up back in Ghana. Another conference to discuss the way forward for positive action was held in Accra in April 1960, Positive Action for Peace and Security in Africa. While Nkrumah opened the conference with a speech advocating “nonviolent positive action” as the main tactic, after the criticism of Frantz Fanon and pressure from some other African delegates, the conference’s emphasis on continent –wide nonviolent positive action was muted. Nevertheless, Bill Sutherland and Matt Meyer describe positive action as being “a phenomenal success for Gandhian strategy.” Nonviolent tactics were used as part of a self-conscious overall nonviolent strategy that led Ghana quickly to independence with minimal casualities. They included consciousness-raising among the people about their right to self-government, a determination to act in concert with each other through a variety of associations, and a willingness to accept imprisonment. Boycotts and strikes showed the people that withdrawing cooperation leaves colonial forces powerless (and that cooperation reinforces subjection). Many marginalized sectors of society were mobilized in a common cause, including the youth, market women, and elementary school graduates. Newspapers and popular songs spread the message of the movement and the leaders emphasis on the need for nonviolent discipline resonated with people’s deeply held value systems. There was the grace to accept compromise in certain situations as well as the determination to go the harder way of strikes and imprisonment when sacrifice was required. The impact of mass nonviolent civil resistance on shaping Ghanaian nationalism needs further exploration, but it is clear – if rarely acknowledged – that if facilitated this process of nation building.

Poland – Nonviolent resistance was the key to throw off occupation but official histories have covered these success stories up in favor of glorified violent struggle

Bartkowski 13, Senior Director at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict

(Maciej, Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles, pg. 274)

A critical attitude toward organic work is particularly perplexing given the extent to which the nineteenth-century nonviolent resistance and its constructive program of creating and running parallel institutions served as an inspiration for future generations of Poles faced with oppression. The conspiratorial experience of organizing and running secret education became ingrained in the collective memory of the national resistance. It was recalled during traumatic events such as the German occupation of 1939 – 1945 and during communist rule, particularly during the 1970s and 1980s when widespread illegal education (including the reestablishment of the flying university) ensured the truthful reading of national history, culture, and tradition. In fact, working at the base of society became the imperative nonviolent strategy of the anticommunist opposition. Solidarity leaders drew parallels between their nonviolent efforts to liberate the society from the control of the communist government and the nonviolent strategies of nineteenth century organicists to undermine the authority of the partitioning powers. Bohdan Cywinski’s influential Genealogy of the Defiant (1971) studied the fin-de-siecle (defiant ones) and made parallels between their nonviolent defiant attitude and practice against the czarist government and the then contemporary resistance to communism. That book inspired thousands of Poles and showed clearly how a century old tradition of nonviolent resistance – although generally underappreciated in the national annals – could play a vital role in shaping the thinking, and determining the strategies and actions, of a new generation of unarmed resisters struggling with no less oppressive autocratic rulers than their indomitable predecessors who lived under partitions. Without nonviolent resistance, Poles could not have taken charge of their national destiny after World War I or changed the geopolitical situation in their favor during the 1980s. It would have been equally implausible to integrate partitioned lands after 1918 and establish statehood so swiftly without the base of social, economic, and cultural development constructed through organic work. Although nonviolent resistance has been widely used by different generations of Poles against both external occupation and domestic dictatorship, this form of struggle is still awaiting much-deserved recognition of its role in not only defending, but essentially reimagining, the Polish nation.

#### Non-violence is not passivity – it’s just a different means of waging conflict that creates a strong break with politics as usual

Martin 08, Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong

(Brian, How nonviolence is misrepresented, http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/08gm2.html#\_edn1)

Nonviolent action, as a technique of political communication and waging conflict, can be distinguished from conventional action and from violence. Conventional political action includes voting, lobbying and campaigning - anything that is routine within a society. Conventional economic action includes working, and buying and selling goods and shares. Conventional social action includes meetings of clubs or neighbours, charitable work and much else. Nonviolent action, in contrast, goes beyond routine behaviour, often by challenging conventional practices. Examples include protesters disrupting a government meeting by dressing as clowns, a neighbourhood association setting up an alternative system of social welfare, war resisters refusing to pay taxes, consumer activists blocking service in a bank by opening and closing small accounts, bus drivers refusing to collect fares, office workers sending large files to clog an email system, and communities setting up local currencies. The boundary between conventional and nonviolent action depends on the circumstances. When government repression is severe, handing out a leaflet might count as nonviolent action, whereas in some places strikes are so common and widely accepted that participating in one might be considered conventional action. Violence means physical force used against humans, including imprisonment, beatings, shootings, bombings and torture.[4] Nonviolent action excludes these. Sabotage - violence against objects - lies at the boundary between violence and nonviolence.[5] Nonviolent action thus encompasses a wide range of activities that go beyond conventional, routine action but do not involve physical violence against humans. When people think about nonviolent protests, rallies and sit-ins commonly come to mind, but there are many other sorts, such as workers refusing to tear down an iconic building, judges resigning in protest over political pressure, roads activists digging up streets and planting crops, and office workers misplacing or destroying files on dissidents targeted for surveillance and arrest. Nonviolent action is action - it doesn't include passivity or inaction - and it goes beyond conventional methods of political communication and waging conflict, such as discussion, negotiation or lobbying. Nonviolent action is nonviolent on the part of those who use it. Their opponents can and often do use violence, sometimes brutally.