

given over to the state no longer safeguards citizens but becomes a weapon of persecution.

In these circumstances, the state forfeits its right to monopolize violence. The right returns to the people, who may now reclaim this force as their due power. It is crucial to note here that the resolution prescribes parameters for when violence is just, and those are when it is a response to the oppression initiated by another agent. So, an affirmation isn't an overarching endorsement of violence but recognition of its legitimacy as a check on certain social conditions.

Subpoint B: the right to violently rebel is justified as a form of self-defense. Historically, despotic regimes have killed their citizens. This is the norm, not the exception. Political historian R.J. Rummel proves this in his book *Death by Government*. His research shows that 262 million people were slaughtered by their rulers worldwide from 1900 to 1987. He summarizes: "[This] figure far exceeds the 34 million battle deaths thought to have resulted from the international and civil wars during the same period."

Rummel identifies 218 regimes that committed democide during this time period and adds that the murder rates are assuredly underreported since oppressive leaders try to hide their death tolls. Thus, empirically oppression threatens lives. To further this point analytically, any right you have in an oppressive regime is bankrupt because it is granted solely on the state's whim. Your life is always threatened since your dignity can be stripped at any time, making all rights insecure. Oppressive rulers by definition no longer exercise control legitimately and thus physical coercion becomes commonplace, making violence against the state a proportional response. Every person has the right to self-defense when threatened. Just as we cannot condemn the individual use of violence when assaulted, we cannot condemn citizens who use violence for their collective benefit. Both criminals and the oppressor have willfully created a situation in which justice is achieved at their detriment.

With these subpoints in mind, violent rebellion is proven in two distinct ways to be an inherent right. As a liberty due to people, an affirmation is already supported since the link to justice is clear. However, I will move to my next level of analysis, which addresses the practical objections often raised to revolution.

Contention Two: Any revolution to restore rights will include violence. Even the two most renowned nonviolent uprisings had some violent support. The Indian Independence effort was sparked by the Sepoy Mutiny, a bloody rebellion against the British. Similarly, Malcolm X and the Black Panthers provided the threat of violence that enticed the state to take Martin Luther King seriously during the civil rights movement. King even warned U.S. officials that if they ignored peaceful resistance, they would risk bloody riots, making the fear of violence a powerful negotiating tool. Nonviolence only has any hope of working when targeted against states that are otherwise democratic and