Al-Quds University

Deanship of Graduate Studies

Violence and Nonviolence in U.S. Democracy: African-American Struggle for Civil Rights

Alia Mohammad Ali Swailem

M.Sc. thesis

Jerusalem – Palestine

2014 - 1435

Violence and Nonviolence in U.S. Democracy: African-American Struggle for Civil Rights

Submitted By:

Alia Mohammad Ali Swailem

Bachelor of English Language

Al Quds Open University

Supervisor: Dr. Rachel Busbridge

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's Degree in American Studies, Department of Regional Studies, Deanship of Graduate Studies, Al-Quds University

2014 - 1435

Al-Quds University

Deanship of Graduate Studies

Institute for Regional Studies

American Studies

Thesis Approval
Violence and Nonviolence in U.S Democracy:
African-American Struggle for Civil Rights

Prepared by: Alia Mohammad Ali Swailem

Registration No.: 21011191

Supervisor: Dr. Rachel Busbridge

Master thesis submitted and accepted, Date 21/1/2014

The name and signatures of the examining committee members are as follows.

1. Head of committee: Dr. Rachel Busbridge
2. Internal examiner: Prof. Mohammd Dajani
3. External examiner: Dr. Bashir Bashir

Jerusalem – Palestine

1435 - 2014

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my mother's soul and to advocate democratic life around the world

Declaration

I declare that this thesis presents work carried out by myself and does not incorporate without acknowledgment any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university; and that is to the best of my knowledge, It does not contain any materials previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text; and all substantive contributions by others to the work presented, including jointly authored publications, are clearly acknowledged.

Signed: .....

Alia Mohammad Ali Swailem

Date: 21/1/2014

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor

Dr. Rachel Busbirdge for her everlasting guidance and great support.

Also, I would like to thank, Professor **Mohammad Dajani** who taught me many courses and opened my eyes to study; this has taught me and enriched my knowledge about American culture.

I pay special tribute to **Dr. Sami Musallam** for his assistance and encouragement.

Abstract

Often, people tend to assume that democratic societies are inherently non-violent; however, this presumption is not necessarily correct and may in fact be politically problematic. Thus, this study aims to clarify the existing relationship between democracy, violence and nonviolence. In doing so, it looks at the African American struggle for civil rights as a case study, revealing the complex forms of intertwining violent and nonviolent resistance in democratic societies. The African American nonviolent civil rights struggle shows how the United States, as a democratic nation, abandoned nonviolence and resorted to violence in many instances.

The study has two important propositions; first, there is a relationship between each of violence, nonviolence and democracy. Second, the more democratic society is, the more it is able to use nonviolent methods and abandons violence ones in solving domestic conflicts. In order to prove these propositions the researcher arrived at the following results: First, violence in the American Civil War was one of the main tools in the foundation of democracy. Second, violence was not only practiced against African Americans during slavery phases, but it was also practiced throughout democratic era. Third, nonviolence is an important tool to advance and strengthen democracy. Regarding this point, the study shows how African American civil rights movements, under the leadership of Martin Luther King, had been successful in advancing American democracy throughout the adoption of nonviolent strategies.

The methodology in this research is exploratory, historical, and analytical, in approach and it adopts the historical information about the African American civil rights struggle to explore the relationship between democracy, violence and nonviolence.

While a good number of research done in Arabic explores violence, nonviolence and democracy as separate issues, this research tackles the relationships between these important concepts combined. Therefore, this study will be translated into Arabic at a later stage to pave the way for Arab readers to realize the significance of understanding the relationship of democracy with violence and nonviolence.

This study strongly recommends that more in-depth research should be conducted in order to have a better understanding of this integrated relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy. In addition, the more research is investigated and implemented around this topic, the more it enriches our understanding, and fills the gap that was unintentionally missed in this thesis.

Table of content

Declaration i

Acknowledgement ii

Abstract iii

الملخص 82

Table of content v

Chapter I: Introduction 1

A. Research Statement 1

B: Research Objectives: 1

C: Research Justification 2

D: Problem Statement 2

E: Research Questions 3

F: Research Hypothesis 3

G: Research Methodology and Data Collection 4

H: Research Limitations 4

Chapter II: Theoretical Framework & Literature Review 5

A. Research Theoretical Framework 5

B. Literature Review 6

Chapter III: Violence & Nonviolence Resistance 14

A: Introduction 14

B: What is Violence? 14

C: Forms of violence at the political level 17

a: Political violence 18

b: Structural violence 19

c: Institutional violence 20

D: Violence by the State 20

E: Violent Resistance against State-Based Oppression 21

E. Nonviolence.....23

1: Nonviolent resistance in politics.....25

2: Moral considerations of nonviolence.....25

3: Efficiency of nonviolence as a tactic.....28

E: Conclusion.....30

Chapter IV: Democracy Relationship to Each of Nonviolence and Violence.....32

A: Introduction.....32

B: Defining Democracy.....33

C: Democracy & Nonviolence.....35

D: Democracy & Violence.....38

E. Conclusion.....47

Chapter V: African Americans Experience in Violence, Nonviolence and Democracy 49

A: Introduction:.....49

B: Slavery and violence in America (1619-1865).....50

C: Democracy, Violence and African Americans Situation.....56

D: Democratic Society Reaction towards African American's Nonviolence.....63

Conclusion.....68

Chapter VI.....70

Conclusion.....70

Bibliography:.....76

A: Books.....76

B: Articles.....78

Chapter I: Introduction

A. Research Statement

This research examines the relationship of democracy with violence and nonviolence. Despite the fact democracy is one of the most important concepts in contemporary politics, its relationship with other concepts, such as violence or nonviolence, is often left under-explored or taken for granted. However, the question is how and why does violence persist in democracies and the struggles for democracy?

Going back to history, one can find out that conflicts were among the most prominent phenomena in human life. From the past times till the present, human beings have been suffering from conflicts causing destructive consequences. This motivates us to investigate the tools that were used in such conflicts and struggles. One of the main tools of conflict is violence. Thus, it is crucial to understand what violence is, because conflicts and violence always occur together. In this perspective, nonviolence is a tool of change, which oppressed people depend upon. For instance, nonviolence was chosen by Indian people from a long time as a main tool of struggle against Britain. Consequently, it is proper to indicate that both violence and nonviolence continue to occupy a significant role in various conflicts and struggles around the world.

In this context, it can be argued that both violence and nonviolence are also main tools employed in contemporary democracies. While both appear in democratic practices, it is; nevertheless, important to emphasize that, contrary to popular belief, a violent force is utilized in democratic societies as much as nonviolence

B: Research Objectives:

This research has three primary goals:

1. To clarify the role and significance of violence and nonviolence in politics.

2. To examine the relationships between violence, nonviolence and democracy.

3. To present African American life and struggle for civil rights as a case study to extract lessons to learn: a) challenge violent practices through and after slavery

abolition b) respond to violence laws that were imposed on them in democratic era; c) advocate democracy through nonviolent resistance.

C: Research Justification

The intricate relationships between democracy, violence and nonviolence are often missed, leading to potentially problematic political implications in so far as it means that people are unable to develop a subtler understanding of oppression and injustice in democratic societies. In exploring these relationships, this research fills an important gap in the literature. It is also important in the sense that this research is conducted with an eye towards comprehending the Palestinian situation. Exploring the struggle for civil rights struggles in the United States, and the relationships between democracy, violence and nonviolence offers a valuable opportunity to reflect regarding the resistance against the Israeli occupation.

D: Problem Statement

Democracy as a concept is familiar to many people. It is a Greeks term meaning "the rule of the people" and has been associated with freedom, equality and other values. Violence carries negative connotations; thus many people think that violence is the opposites of democracy and peace. However, is this claim true? What is the relationship between violence and democracy? The relationship between them goes back in history, when violence was a main instrument in many revolutions that planted the foundation of democratic ideals. The problem is that many people deny such relationship between violence and democracy; therefore, this study explores the important of this relationship. In fact, if one understands that violence laid the foundation of democracies in the French and American present democratic system, for example, this would lead to an understanding that there exists between them a real relationship; thus, the negative effects of violence in future struggles shall be averted. Accordingly, we have to know how democracy is shaped and under what conditions. In this manner, this understanding would be useful so that people would realize that democratic governments can practice violence, and this would give them an insight about which tools of struggle they can adopt in facing any kind of oppression.

On the other hand, nonviolence has played an important role in democratic societies; many people believe that democratic societies are nonviolent. Some believe that a democratic society is far from any practice of violence in domestic affairs. However, this is not always true. In reality, democratic societies practice different kinds of political violence, institutional violence and structural violence. African American civil rights struggle provides us with a concrete example of the relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy. Every phase of African American life is a good example on this relationship. For example, the slavery phase showed that violence was practiced against African Americans. Thus, we can see the interaction between state violence and democracy especially when African Americans were excluded from exercising democratic rights. Lastly, we will discuss why civil rights movements advocated democracy by adopting the nonviolent strategies.

E: Research Questions

This research centers on three core questions:

- What is the role and significance of violence and nonviolence in politics?
- Is there a relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy?
- Can we consider African-American life and struggle as a case study model to represent the relationship between violence, nonviolence in U.S democracy?

F: Research Hypothesis

There is a relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy. The more democratic society is, the more it is able to use nonviolent methods and abandons violence ones in solving domestic conflicts. African American nonviolence struggle for civil rights improved and advanced the integrated relationship between nonviolence and democracy. This suggests that democracy is a relative concept, i.e. it is a project that is never fully fulfilled and as such, it must always be pursued and held accountable for itself. If fighting violence strengthens democracy, then African Americans furthered democracy in the United States by adopting a nonviolent resistance to challenge societal oppression.

G: Research Methodology and Data Collection

Methodology in this research is exploratory, historical, and analytical, in approach and it adopts African American success in nonviolent struggle for their civil rights as a case study. The previous literature on the subject will be referred to clarify the historical background and theoretical framework. The African American case offers a practical example for these concepts, and it shows how each concept of violence, nonviolence and democracy has real implications on the ground. The research will address the meaning and role of the three concepts namely, violence, nonviolence and democracy in politics. It also presents the relationships between these three concepts in order to benefit from their results. From a historical point view, information will be gathered about violence in the American civil war. Then, it will be analyzed to explore how it is related to the foundation of democracy. Then, a collection of this historical information will be resumed to explore the relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy through African American life and struggle.

H: Research Limitations

The relationship, between violence and democracy, is very complex; as a result, books on this relationship in Arabic language are not available in Palestinian universities.

Second: The fact that the researcher is unable to conduct interviews with American politicians who can give information about the relation between violence, nonviolence and democracy posed another limitation.

Third: It is not easy to reach African Americans who can supply information about the relationship between democracy and nonviolence strategy that they followed.

Chapter II: Theoretical Framework & Literature Review

A. Research Theoretical Framework

This research takes as its theoretical point of departure Adrian Little's (2005: 1) account of the relationship between violence and democracy; he argues that 'democratic societies have always been founded on the basis of violent engagement'. Similarly, the research works of Ross's (2004: 3) contend that the 'heart of democracy is always violent' and that contemporary politics reveal "new forms of violent potential of democracy". Both of these authors indicate a relationship between violence and democracy, which suggests that democracy may be founded on violence and that there is a relation between the practice of democracy and violence. As a foundational theoretical premise, Little (2005) and Ross's (2004) works offer a valuable opportunity to explore the relationship(s) between democracy and violence from a critical perspective, as they move beyond the typical notion that democracy and violence are opposites.

In order to explore the complexities of violent and nonviolent resistance in democracies, this research continues from the respective theorizing of Herbert Marcuse (1967) and Gene Sharp (1973). On one side, Marcuse (1967) explores violent resistance in a democratic society. In reference to state-sanctioned institutional violence and oppression, he seeks to understand why people may resort to violent struggle in order to achieve their rights. He argues that the establishment has a legal monopoly of violence and people have the positive right, even the duty, to use violence in its self-defense. On the other side, Gene Sharp (1973) indicates that nonviolent resistance, as nonviolent actions, are designed to operate against opponents who are able and willing to use violence. While coming from two different theoretical perspectives on conflict and struggle, both Marcuse and Sharp suggest that violence, nonviolent resistance and democracy are related to each other in their objectives of seeking equality and freedom.

In terms of the normative perspective of this research, R.J. Rummel's (1998) work on nonviolence and democracy will be used to show how genuine democracy ought to be nonviolent. In his book *Power Kills Democracy: Nonviolence as a Method of Democracy*, we find that the relationship between nonviolence and democracy is

possible. Rummel clarifies that the characteristics of democratic society are parallel with the characteristics of nonviolent systems. Rummel's argument aligns with Sharp's theory of nonviolent resistance, which stresses that a nonviolent resistance is a necessary strategy to undermine the passive support that citizens give to the status quo. Once this support is withdrawn, no regime, whether despotic or democratic, can survive for a long time, for the power of the status quo begins to disappear with the withdrawal of the people's support. This is why Sharp calls this strategy "politics of ordinary people" (Allen, 2009: 14). This perspective is important since it offers an insight into the possibilities of both democracy and nonviolent resistance, and the way in which the latter is the way to a better democracy through undermining the status quo.

B. Literature Review

Many studies dealt with defining violence, nonviolence, and democracy. Mahatma Gandhi (2009) defines violence "as the intention to coerce someone into doing what he or she might not want to do. This according to him, is in sharp contrast with nonviolence in which adherents believe [sic] do not intend to force their views or situations on people" (in Allen, 2009: 6).

"Violence is the use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against a person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death" (WHO, 2002). Violence definitions make many people look to violence as a destructive tool, and they deny that violence sometimes plays a transformational role in making important changes in many societies. This transformational role becomes clear when people can regain their freedom, dignity and rights through violent resistance. "People resort to violence when they have lost their dignity, independence and rights" (Sharp, 1996: 7).

Many theorists talk about nonviolence as a tool that can resolve domestic conflicts. Rand Shutt argues, "a key feature of nonviolence is its insistence on resisting oppressive and unjust practices with instruments that neither lead to nor promote killing or physical violence against the opponent. It refers to the waging of a struggle or war by withdrawing support for unjust practices, regimes, politics, behaviors, laws and institutions. This may manifest through a variety of actions such as strike,

protests, and campaigns" (Schutt, 2005: 3). Schutt points out the ability of nonviolence to make a change without destruction. Explanations and definitions about nonviolent strategies often bring about better impressions in people's mind than what violence can, and as a result, people can easily link nonviolence with democratic values.

Correspondingly, democracy is defined as a government of people. According to Spitzer, democracy means that what the people want matters. Spitzer also claims "the essence of democracy is the participation of the people in choosing their rulers and the people's ability to influence what those rulers do" (Spitzer, 2002:12-14). We find the word people in every democratic definition. Therefore, people participation is the key word in any democratic rule.

However, people often think that the relationship between violence and democracy is paradoxical. This contradiction is not necessarily true. On the contrary, there is a relationship between these two different concepts. Adrian Little (2005) argues that most people share the idea that violence is contrary to democracy, yet politics is often violent. Certainly, many democracies are built upon the foundations of violent conflict (Little, 2005: 26). Of course, in this context, we cannot equate between violence and democracy. We can only indicate that there are often common ends between them such as freedom and equality. Referring to Ted Honderich, "the proposition that violence does, as a matter of fact, promote progress towards freedom and equality in some circumstances, can hardly be questioned". (Honderich, 1976: 110). The most prominent example that demonstrates this relationship is the American civil war. Throughout this war, it was clear how violence played an important role in achieving democratic values. "The American civil war (1861-1865) was one of the most violent times in the history of the United States. More than 600,000 men gave their lives for their country in that war. The American civil war was obviously a watershed event in the evolution of democracy in the United States." (Berolzheimer, 2012:1). Thus, there is a strange and complex relationship between violence and democracy, but we cannot deny that historical events of the American civil war can help us to clarify this complex relationship.

On the other side, many people believe that democratic societies are non-violent, or that democracy equals nonviolence**.** In this context, there is also an important

relationship between nonviolence and democracy. In fact, nonviolence can be a method of democracy. In his book *Power Kills democracy: Nonviolence as a Method of Democracy.* Rummel goes on to support his assumptions by gathering several common factors between nonviolence and democracy.

Nevertheless, both violence and nonviolence take place in democratic practices. In reality, many democratic countries practice different forms of violence to solve domestic conflicts. Consequently, there is political violence, structural violence and state violence, which are monopolized by authority. "Political development may be called a movement not from violence to nonviolence but rather than from the sharing by all people of the means of violence to a monopoly of violence by those who govern, with the consent of those who are governed" (Davis, 1971: 3). Indeed, violence and nonviolence can often be understood as the tools of democracy. For instance, people not only elect who governs but also grant them the authority to use the suitable tools in solving domestic conflicts and struggles. These tools could be negotiations, nonviolence or unfortunately violence.

However, the relationship between democracy and violence is in fact far more complicated. Historically, people largely resorted to violent resistance towards the oppression they faced. Little argues "foundation of peaceful democracy in the present depends on the articulation in the past. Therefore, visions of democracy that ignore the centrality of violence in the past and the present are anachronistic" (Little, 2005: 26). Similarly, Jonathan added, "the freedom of speech and press, and the rights of petition and assembly now set forth in our own and other Bills of Rights were originally won by violent revolution**." (**Bingham, 1970: 118**).**

The relationship between violence and democracy was not exclusive to how violence founded democracy. It exceeded this limit and was used as a mechanism of control**.** The state is a violent institution, in that it has a monopoly on violence. American political values can easily come into conflict when it comes to real practices between the government and citizens. American history shows that many conflicts and wars happened in order to reach equality between people. The unequal application of values or laws between different races inspired protests, demonstrations and violent resistance. Such resistance, according to Marcuse (1967), is the right of people to make change in the positive law. Marcuse clarifies that "the concept of violence

covers two different forms, the institutional violence of the established system and the violence of resistance, which is necessarily illegal in relation to positive law" (Marcuse, 1967: 6). In this context, structural violence can be added; it can be another form of embedded violence. According to Winter "structural violence is a term that was first formulated by Johan Galtung in 1969 to refer to “any constraint on human potential due to economic and political structures. Structural violence is self-feeding and, left unchecked, leads to direct violence” (Winter& Leighton, 2001:1). Unlike direct violence, the most horrific matter in structural violence is its invisibility. Moreover, political violence is another form of violence, directed against people. "Political violence is a considerable or destructive use of force against person or things, a use of force prohibited by law and directed to a change in the policies, personnel or system of government, and hence changes in society. This definition covers things like race riots in America" (Bingham, 1970: 97-98). Bingham points out that in this kind of violence, many segments of society are engaged. Ted Honderich (1974) asserts “we have been told those policemen, landlords, employers, shopkeepers, and indeed whole social classes and the state itself, engage with violence as a matter of course" (Honderich, 1974:97).

This raises the question of resistance to injustice - how should resistance proceed, and what is required to change unjust and oppressive laws and practices? In fact, when oppressed people resort to violent resistance, it seems impossible and not allowed. Constantly, institutional and structural violence by the state against people is often hidden and takes the cover of legality and what is permissible. In this context, Marcuse defends people's right in resistance violence by saying: "violence is not always a destructive force. There is violence of suppression and violence of liberation; there is violence for defense of life and violence of aggression. And both forms have been and will remain historical forces." (Marcuse, 1967) In other words, Marcuse here asserts that force of violence is not always destructive. It can be used to defend people`s rights and dignity especially when they face suppression, aggression and exploitation.

On the other hand, nonviolent resistance is an important form of people’s resistance. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. is perhaps the most popular proponent of nonviolence struggle in American history. He led the African American civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. He waged nonviolent conflict in pursuit of political goals,

justice and equality; he believed that results would come from the use of nonviolence in the struggle. As he wrote"social change comes most meaningfully through nonviolent action" (King, 1967: 6). Echoing King's sentiments, Gene Sharp (1996) added that the practice of authorities depends on the acceptance and submission of the people. Therefore, people can control and destroy the authority by withdrawing their acceptance and cooperation (Sharp, 1996: 8). Moreover, Washington said, "The method of nonviolence is based on the conviction that all decent wise people are on the side of justice. It requests that nonviolent resistance accepts suffering without violent retaliation" (Washington, 1986: 9)

Lessons and conclusions can also be drawn from African American actions and reactions to each concept. Many oppressive laws were imposed on African Americans by the state and mainstream American society. Moreover, African Americans faced structural, institutional violence, lynching, and suppression. All of these violent practices reveal the truth of claiming democracy for all citizens. Therefore, it can be concluded that through democratic era the racial gap was widened and the state was allowed to brand African Americans as an inferior race.

This racism and segregation led to the development of opposition groups aimed at destroying discrimination and segregation, which promoted the creation of black institutions. Thus, civil rights movement is clearly one of the pivotal developments of the twentieth century. Oppressed groups are not always in a position to generate changes through social protest, but suitable political conditions can play a crucial role in creating the circumstances conducive to protest. Social movement scholars, such as McAdam (1982) and Tarow (1994), assert that social protest is more likely to occur if there a favorable political opportunity structure exists (in Morris, 1999: 522). A very important concept called "favorable political opportunity" means that people choose the kind of struggle according to the most suitable political opportunity. For African Americans, already present (if partial) democracy in the United States can be noticed as one of the prominent factors enabling their struggle. So according to Morris (1999: 522) civil rights movement depended on factors that helped them in the following ways. First, by the time the civil rights movements unfolded, African Americans had amassed a new level of political power because of the northern black vote. Second, the politics of the Cold War was an additional factor making black protest a viable option. The United States and the Soviet Union were locked in an intense battle to win

over newly independent Third World countries, especially those in Africa. The issue of American racism was an impediment to an American foreign policy bent on persuading African nations to align themselves with the United States. Racism and democracy were opposite ideologies and African American leaders were aware that America's treatment of African Americans could be an obstacle in the American quest to become the major post-World War Two superpower. Fourth, "the coming of age of modern communication technologies in the 1950s and early 1960s also played a role" (Sterling & Kittross, 1978). Technological developments enabled African American protests to be viewed globally, which empowered them to affect international public opinion to sympathize with them (Morris, 1999: 522). The last factor that enabled the movements to gain success in achieving their rights was the emergence of Martin Luther King.

Therefore, democracy in the United States offers interesting grounds for this exploration. While the United States claimed to be one of the most democratic states in the world, many African Americans were prevented from voting and from all aspects of democratic life. Peaceful protest is allowed in democratic countries. When African Americans adopted nonviolence strategy in the civil rights movement, it was the government did not accept this as a right to protest. It was faced with state opposition under the justification of enforcing laws. Bingham (1970) reminds us that: "in disobeying a law believed unjust, it may be difficult to avoid breaking other laws, which may be valid and necessary. Conservatives claimed that the disobedience may contribute to a general breakdown of law and hence an increase of crime" (Bingham, 1970:119). However, the conservatives at that time failed to remember that crimes against black citizens were also against the law. For example, lynching African Americans reflects the bias in policies between African Americans and whites. Referring to Beck and Tolany "between emancipation and the great depression, about 3000 African Americans were lynched in the American south, despite the extensive commentary observations of the lynching era (e.g. Cutler, 1905; Raper, 1933; White, 1929, 1969; Young, 1927). Violence was used by marginal whites to force black tenant farmers off desirable land" (William, 1984) or to drive away successful black businessmen or landowners (in Beck& Tolany, 2003: 526-528). Despite of oppression and slavery, which attended with violence, despite of discrimination, segregation and inequality between whites and African Americans, African-American, adopted

nonviolence strategy, which arguably enabled them to advocate democracy and claim their rights.

In conclusion, most people share the knowledge that violence is contrary to democracy. Nevertheless, there are three important matters. One, violence sometimes serves the practice of democracy. As Ted argues, "some violence, as we have just seen, may serve the ends in the fundamental arguments for the practice of democracy", and thus some violence may be named democratic violence (Honderich, 1976: 115). Second: violence in many civil wars was often the foundation of democracy. As Little claims, “the relationship between democracy and violence is their foundation" (Little, 2005: 9). Third, violence and nonviolence can be the tools of democracy. For instance, US democracy is not exempt from practicing violence. Like all states, it uses violence in different forms such as: state violence, political violence, structural and institutional violence. Thus, nobody can deny the fact that violence and authority are associated. "Despite the contradiction between authority and violence, they always appeared together" (Arendt, 1992: 46).

In addition and for many reasons, people also resort to violence in its resistance form. However, violent resistance always looks hard, illegal, destructive and not allowed from the authorities, but it can hold the hope for change. Referring to Krebs (2007: 90), "Revolutionary violence has little hope of anything but recreating the violent conditions against which is allegedly works".

Certainly, the emergence of moral consideration in nonviolent struggle is very important. It opens another peaceful direction for oppressed people to opposition and protest. It has the power and the ability to make an efficient change especially in democratic societies. Dealing with democracy and nonviolence, we can find that nonviolence can be considered as a method of democracy.

Violent resistance and nonviolence are having the power to make change in society. There are writers and activists who support nonviolence such as Gene Sharp, Martin Luther King Jr., and Mahatma Gandhi. Others wrote about violence and violent resistance, such as Frantz Fanon, Hannah Arendt and Hebert Marcuse, who pointed out the efficacy of violence in certain contexts. Some of them, such as Derrida, see violence occurring for the “sake of life” (Derrida, 2002: 288). However, nobody encourages violence in its destructive meaning; also, no one can predict or determine

how oppressed people will behave in facing oppression. Therefore, we can argue that historically, the surrounding circumstances and the political opportunities in democratic era had guided African Americans to adopt nonviolent struggle. In summary, people who ask for democratic life and people who are still facing oppression and occupation are the main targets of this research. Through exploring the relationships between violence, nonviolence and democracy, they will be granted an opportunity to learn and avoid destructive results. It will also become clear that adopting a nonviolent struggle is more efficacious to achieve their rights and liberties.

Chapter III: Violence & Nonviolence Resistance

A: Introduction

Violence has been linked to human behavior from the early beginning of history. It has been known as a critical concept in theorizations, occupying a central place in contemporary policy and political theory. Accordingly, this chapter is an introductory sketch for each of violence, nonviolence and their relationships to state authority. It gives different definitions, views and analysis for each concept and it provides the reasons that drive or force many people to resort to violence. While there are different reasons or causes for violence, many who commit, resort or prefer violence boast that violence has the ability to fulfill their demands faster than other solutions.

In *Chapter Three*, the main question is: What is violence? Various definitions, theories and views of violence will be presented. In the second part, forms of violence in political levels will be discussed. The third part will explore violence from two directions: first is violence by the state and the second is violent resistance against state oppressive practices. In this discussion, it will be emphasized that violence especially in its destruction force is not justified, but the ways that, through history, violent resistance has played and occupied an important role in political and society change will be pointed out. It holds the force to create a great transformational role in the society, which enabled many nations to achieve their self- determination. The second part of this paper will address the concept of nonviolence. It will define and ask: what is the strategy of nonviolence? Then, it will discuss the moral considerations of nonviolent resistance, and then go through its efficiency as a tactic. Finally, the notion that violence or nonviolence resistance has the ability to bring change in the society will be argued. Particularly, nonviolence is the preferable one, where its efficiency and moral considerations work to save human souls and property.

B: What is Violence?

According to Davis (1971), violence among men goes back to the beginning of human history, when Cain slew his brother Abel and later asked the question "Am I my

brother's keeper?" Violence among citizens, of revolution is the most extreme sort, probably goes as far back in the history of government (Davies, 1971: 3). Violence has been a part of human behavior for a long time, and this violent behavior is justified by its causes and goes back to many reasons, perhaps the reasons due to health, genetics or are acquired from the community. Ronald Bailey (1977) asks if humans are violent by nature. Do they carry in their genes an inescapable urge to kill or harm their fellow humans? On the other hand, is violence learned, taught by the examples and attitudes that one sees in their society? He argues that if violence is the product of learning and culture then there is hope, in that humans can master aggression and save themselves from self-destruction by applying the skills of learning and thinking that set them apart from other animals (Bailey, 1977: 7). These important questions drive us to think about the meaning and forms of violence in the society. But in this chapter, it is intended to focus on the meaning of violence in the domain of the political level. Referring to Edward Guide, "violence does, however, have some unique characteristic. It is violence as a means in the political process, particularly its unique characteristic that is our central concern" (Davis, 1971: 260). Thus, by understanding and studying forms and causes of violence and its relationships with state authority, it will become clear for oppressed and occupied people how to deal with it.

"Most people deplore violence, some people embrace violence, (perhaps reluctantly), and a few people renounce violence, but through all these posters there runs a certain obscurity: it is never entirely clear just what violence is" (Curtin, 1994: 1). It is sometimes difficult to give a definition to violence because it appears as a normal part of our daily life. It is a term that is sometimes invoked in our speaking or practicing. It can be seen or heard everywhere. It is something we damn, resort to or sometimes prefer; this means that violence is a contradictory concept that imposes itself on our life. Thus, violence can be defined from different directions and views. Broadly speaking, violence can be defined as: "the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, or deprivation" (Violence Prevention Alliance, 2010). Robert Audi claims that" violence is a vigorous attack or abuse of persons in physical or philosophical ways" (in Curtin, 1994: 1). From these definitions, it can be seen that

when someone forces or coerces others to do what he or she does not want to do, we can consider this act as a violent act.

The second dimension of violence is that it owns the force or the ability to use it towards something. Etymologically, "violence" means "to carry force toward" something , but using force is inherent in many human deeds and actions; thus, there needs to be a distinction made between force which may be morally justified and that which is not. For example, police are sometimes justified in using force to maintain public safety. But, as the case of Rodney King demonstrates, "police sometimes act violently and without justification. As such, the concept is useful only if defined more narrowly" (in Curtin, 1994: 1).

Many people understand violence as a destructive weapon. Indeed, most definitions of violence lead us to this conclusion. In fact, the question is: Can we say that violence always carries negative effects and meaning? This is a particularly difficult and unclear question when invoked in relation to the objectives and causes of violence. However, the results of violence may help us to determine how we can consider it. Killings, bombings and such attract our attention to the destructive results of it; thus, the effect or the result of violence practices can determine our judgment towards its meaning.

On the other hand, some writers focus on the construct of violence. In their book *Violence: Theory and Ethnography*, Pamela and Andrew (2002) assert that exploring "violence as a construct" compels a number of important questions. In what part should we define violence? Should we analyze violence in terms of its contribution to social control and order, or as a form of behavior that is destructive of order and represents anarchy? Under what circumstances is violence likely to be prevalent? What is the place of violence in wider processes of conflict and settlement? These questions guide the two writers to divide violence in two broad sociological approaches. The first one is in terms of its relationship to "law and order" and tends to define it as subversive of order, and therefore in need of control by coercive restraints. The second approach is symbolic. In this, investigators look for the subjective and cultural meanings associated with violent acts and how these impel or induce the actors to commit acts of violence (Stewart & Andrew, 2002: 2). This leads us to conclude that violence has two faces: it can uphold order or destroy it. "Violence

can be seen as either destroying order or creating it" (Stewart & Andrew, 2002: 2). The strange matter is that controlling violence in many cases leads to the use of violence. For example, many people, citizens, individuals or identity groups, who participate in demonstrations to oppose unaccepted political laws, are considered by police officers as destroying the current order. Similarly, police who violently repress such demonstrators can claim that they maintain the status quo and see themselves as creating order.

Sometimes the definition of violence is changed according to what people or governments want from it. For example, people are divided in terms of how they behave in the same demonstrations. Some support peaceful demonstrations, while others support violence. In this part, violence can be defined to those who resort or prefer a violent demonstration as "violence, which is to attack the police, to destroy property, and to threaten the physical safety of delegates" (Stewart &Andrew, 2002: 3). On the side of police, may be it is the decision to attack the entire demonstration violently whether they are violent or nonviolent. Therefore, violence takes many directions and different interpretations.

C: Forms of violence at the political level

All the significant episodes of violence push us to inquire about its forms. Referring to Garver, "violence occurs in several marked different forms, and can be usefully classified into four different kinds based on two criteria: that is, whether violence is personal or institutional, or overt or covert" (in Curtin, 1994: 2). Understanding these forms is useful to reveal the hidden prevalence of violent actions. These violent forms may be committed against any human inside or outside his or her own society. Human beings can face political, structural, and institutional violence. "Political violence" relates to the political system of the state, which can practice and monopolize violence; "structural violence" refers to the individuals or groups whether they are political or ordinary people who practice direct or indirect violence. "Institutional violence" refers to the institutions that practice overt or covert violence on individuals or groups. In this context, violence forms and practices, which exist between governments and citizens, are given as the main illustrative examples of these different forms.

a: Political violence

What is political violence? What is the relationship between the state authority and political violence? Is political violence exclusive to state authority or people resistance and oppositions can share this form?

"Political violence is defined simply as the use of violence as a social group activity to achieve certain ends. This definition is characterized by several complicated implications regarding decision-making, coordination, goal orientation, and the distribution of costs and benefits; all of which make up politics. The broadest definition thus includes all acts of violence by groups that are intended to alter the political relationships between groups (communal violence) or among groups operating in the political system in general (state violence and anti-state violence)" (Marshall, 1999:54). As we know, the state represents the political system. It is also known that the state political system has the ability to practice violence on people for different reasons. One of these is the imposition of oppressive laws or the unfair distribution of resources and opportunities. These unfair treatments may create people opposition who seek to upset the status quo.

Thus there are two different sides which practice political violence. The first side is people or citizens who perhaps committed political violence in their revolution to change their current political order. The Egyptian revolution can be a good example here, where the ousting of president Hosni Mubarak in 2011 succeeded.

The second is practiced by the state authorities, which can be clear upon African American before the success of civil rights act in 1964. In fact, citizens or their authorities can practice political violence. According to Stewart & Andrew (2002: 26), "our inquiry must include all significant episodes of political violence involving not only that of the state, as a political unit, and the world system, as the concept in which those units operate, but also that of a social group which can seriously challenge or evade the authority of the state. Therefore, political violence is not exclusive to state authorities; it also appears when people want to challenge and change this authority".

b: Structural violence

Kleinman (2000) asserts that the term structural violence refers to the harm inflicted by social forces that systematically assault human dignity, constrain agency, and prevent people from meeting their needs. Galtung has developed structural violence concept in 1969, to address the toll of social structures such as grinding poverty, racism, and sexism on most disadvantaged populations of the world. These afflictions are manifested in the highest rates of disease and death, unemployment, homelessness, lack of education, powerlessness, a shared fate of misery, and the day-by-day violence of hunger, thirst and bodily pain (Kleinman, 2000: 227). "Structural violence can be considered as indirect violence because it can operate as hidden and indirect inside society. Structural violence can also occur in the absence of a clear subject. The principle distinction put forward by Galtung is the existence of indirect or structural violence. He argues that even if there is not an agent who commits violence, individuals may be killed or mutilated, hit or hurt in both senses of the words, and manipulated by means of stick or carrot strategies "(Kleinman, 2000:170).

Structural violence manifests in overt and covert ways: "the manifestation of indirect (structural) violence such as poverty, sexism, and racism contrast with forms of direct (personal) violence including beating, rape, kidnapping, and killing" (Kleinman, 2000: 170). Lastly, structural violence impact can appear in multiple institutions. It can affect human health even in hospitals and work simultaneously with political violence. For instance, political violence can be clear through the unequal practices of state authority in the distribution of the state resources and opportunities. This unequal distribution creates poverty, which supports structural violence in hospitals and other places such as schools. The result is that those who can pay institutions can procure their services.

In recent years, Paul Farmer's work as a physician in the global south has allowed him to make invaluable contribution in evidencing the impact of structural violence in the lives of his patients. His work has expanded the understanding of structural violence by stressing that violence that occurs in the absence of an agent takes place in an environment where underlying social structure constrains the individual agency of the poorest, and thus puts them at risk of tragic fates such as disease or even political violence (Jacome, 2005: 41).

c: Institutional violence

Violence can be practiced in different societal institutions such as courts, schools, military police and prisons. According to Curtin (1994), violence can be institutional as well as individual. The military, the police force, the church, and the educational system are cultural institutions that occasionally use force, which can be justified as a public good. However, these institutions may go beyond force to use violence that undermines the public good (in Curtin, 1994: 2). This again can be overt and covert. In their book (1994), Dean and Robert clarify that overt institutional violence can be seen in, for instance, the victorious army that rapes and pillages. Covert institutional violence is more difficult to identify. Yet, its damage is no less real. For example, if a pervasive assumption is made within a school district that boys, but not girls, should take additional years of science or mathematics, this is covert institutional violence. If a firefighters public exam makes unjustified assumption that only men can be firefighters, this is covert institutional violence (Curtin, 1994: 2). The most important matter of institutional violence is that it can emerge from the singling out of particular groups or individuals. The segregation between African Americans and whites in children schools before 1964 is main evidence about institutional violence.

D: Violence by the State

While the state authority represents the political system, it is also the gatekeeper between internal and external conflicts. The relationship between the state and politics allows us to understand the intimate relationship between violence and politics. State authorities always need force to enforce their policies upon people. Thus, violent force is one of the preferable tools to enforce and practice state policy. In his essay "politics as a vocation", Max Weber stressed "the intimate relationship between politics and violence. He first of all defined the state in terms of a monopoly on the legitimate use of violence, and second in terms of the role of a politician" (in Davis, 1971: 260). Thus, focus on internal state domestic conflicts can help us understand violence and politics intimate relationship.

Regardless of the fact that the state system is democratic or despotic, the state is the political system that owns the power to legalize and monopolize violence according to its interests. For instance, police and military violent practices are included within the umbrella of legal justifications. Therefore, they have a chance to escape punishment

when they abuse human rights through overt and covert institutional violence. Referring to Garver (in Curtin, 1994:2), although the justification for use of military force is widely debated, it seems possible to distinguish between force justified for self-defense and military violence that cannot be justified as legitimate force. As a result, the legality and the legitimacy that the state owns can often produce different types of violence. This is due to the great relationship existing between the state authority and violence especially in domestic conflict management. Certainly, African Americans suffered from different forms of violence, which began from slavery and took different forms due to the cooperation of the state authority and the white society. This indicates that integrated practices of violence upon African Americans lives can occur through overt and covert acceptance and cooperation of the state authority.

Thus, while we cannot say that violence is the only solution that government uses to solve domestic conflicts, it can be said that violence is one of the tools that are used in politics to make change in the society to employ political goals. Referring to Hannah Arendt (1970: 3), "the technical development of the implementation of violence has now reached the point where political goals could conceivably correspond to their destructive potential or justify their active use in armed conflicts". The relationship between violence and the state suggests that there is violence used to maintain the status quo, and there is violence used to bring about state political goals and interests. As we know, violence breeds violence, therefore, we may argue that violence by the state authority could help to forge violent resistance and revolutions from citizens.

E: Violent Resistance against State-Based Oppression

What makes violent resistance? In this matter, opposition from the people can be violent because this opposition may be translated into actions against the state policy, which may in turn be deemed violent by the state authorities. Certainly, this opposition may truly commit violence resistance such as destruction of property and life in order to push the state to answer people demands. Thus, and from the outset, political opposition is placed in the field of violence. Right stands against right, not only as an abstract claim but also as an action. "Again the status quo can have the right to determine the limits of legality. This conflict of the two rights, of the right of

resistance with institutional violence, brings with it the continual danger of clashing with the violence of the state" (Marcuse, 1967).

People who are ruled by state authority have the right to resist state-based violence and oppression. The term "people" refers to all levels of society, including individuals, groups, organizations, institutions, movements, minorities, and majorities. All of these levels may suffer from state suppression and have the right to resist state violence. According to Marcuse, the right of resistance belongs to the oldest and most sanctified element of western civilization. He continues to say that without this right of resistance and without activation of a higher law against existing law, we would still be today at the level of the most primitive barbarism **(**Marcuse, 1967).

Opposition to the state may take the form of violent or nonviolent resistance. As we said before, however, state violence has a large effect on the way of resistance that people may adopt. For instance, when the state allows for peaceful demonstrations people may take the side of nonviolent resistance. In other cases, where the state is very restricted and does not allow for opposition, people may resort to violent resistance. Thus, a large part of the matter is the state policy. Certainly, violent resistance may be in response to state-based oppression and violence. In such contexts, the main reason for violent resistance can be seen in terms of the loss of human dignity, freedom, and rights. As Gene Sharp (1996: 7) asserts, "people resort to violence when they have lost their dignity, independence and rights". Referring to the legality of violent resistance, it is fair to say that there are few governments in the world, which legalize and allow resistance violence which will be against itself. Indeed, Marcuse (1967) asserts that, it is meaningless to speak of the legality of violent resistance: no social system, even the freest, can constitutionally legalize violence directed against it.

As a means of resistance, violence can be particularly effective for several reasons. Firstly, violence has the ability to bring about major change. This becomes clear in the results of many conflicts and civil wars. This major change attracts the state authority. Sometimes, people's demands are heeded faster after large violent actions. For Aristotle, "the emphasis was certainly on political violence that brought about major change rather than simply a conflict management technique. However, he identifies both general and particular causes lead men to employ violence" (Davis, 1971: 260).

Secondly, violence attracts attention, more than nonviolence. As Edward suggests, we never think about, much less attempt to count, the enormous number of significant nonviolent political acts, which occur all the time (in Davis, 1971: 260). Thirdly, often just the threat of violence is enough to achieve objectives. Neiburg stated that "violence has two inextricable aspects: its actual use…and its potential threatened use. The outbreak or demonstration of violence must occur from time to time in order to give plausibility to its threatened outbreak, and thereby to gain efficacy for the threat as an instrument of social and political change (in Davis, 1976: 262). As such, the success of violence in civil wars or other revolutions makes it a central concern in many situations. This, of course, does not suggest that violence is the only means of resistance; nevertheless, it is one of the effective means.

E. Nonviolence

"Nonviolent civil disobedience means a moral obligation to refuse to cooperate with unjust social system" (Colaiaco, 1993: 25). Indeed, nonviolent struggle is not a new one. Mahatma Gandhi claimed asserted "nothing new to teach the world. Truth and nonviolence are as old as the hills". Gandhi was sure that nonviolent resistance was the only way by which India could gain its political freedom (in Gregg, 1960: 69). The awareness of nonviolence power is not new, but Gandhi heralded its value in many domestic conflicts. This value lies with the success of this strategy to avoid the destructive results of violent resistance. Therefore, many oppressed people in the world go after nonviolence to bring real change to society, such as changing the regime in Egypt in 2011, changing state policy towards African Americans in 1964-1965, and the success of Gandhi's nonviolent struggle in India.

Compared to violent resistance, nonviolence costs less in terms of life and property, which has encouraged many occupied or oppressed people to study its nature and methods. According to Irwin and Fasion (1984: 2), millions, in Poland, Bolivia, and elsewhere, have made gains against or even overthrown oppressive regimes through nonviolent action. However**,** nonviolent actions require very special conditions if it is meant to work; this needs to be better understood and evaluated. These are derived from certain assumptions about conflict and struggle. Accordingly, what is a nonviolent action?

> "Nonviolent action is a means of social struggle which has begun to be developed in a conscious way only in the last several decades. It does not rely on the good will of the opponent but instead is designed to work in the face of determined opposition or violent repression. It is not limited to any race, nationality, social class, or gender and has been used successfully in widely varying political circumstances"(Irwin & Faison, 1984:2).

In politics, nonviolence can play a strong role in changing policy or overturning existing regimes. As Gandhi said, "a ruler can not rule if the people do not obey", for rulers are powerless without the support and cooperation of the people. The strategy for carrying out the mass nonviolent struggle used by Gandhi was the "Satyagraha". Satyagraha is formed of two parts." Satya" which means "truth" which is also equal to love, and "agraha" means "force". Thus, Satyagraha means truth force or love force (Odeh, 2006: 80-81). Like violence, nonviolence has the ability to make change in the society. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was attracted to these effects of nonviolent action. He studied this strategy and believed that it would be a suitable tool for making change in American policy. After visiting India, King concluded that nonviolent struggle is the only valid approach for major social and political change, because the other two options of submission and violence are undesirable. "Acquiescence and submission leads to suicide. Violence leaves the survivors embittered and the opponents scared from the brutality that they had inflicted" (King, 1964: 133). This bad feeling will make the opponent who committed it afraid and scared from the reflection of violent action. On the other side, people who follow nonviolent actions will leave their opponent peacefully without necessarily feeling afraid of retaliation. In fact, nonviolence allows for the persuasion of those who have committed wrong deeds. Thus, it is based more on persuasion than coercion; "nonviolent resistance is constantly seeking to persuade his opponent that he is wrong", and "it is essential to understand that the aim is to persuade" (Phillips, 1998: 62). When persuasion of nonviolence is held between people, it will make them more powerful." At the same time this makes Faison indicate: "Nonviolence is a means by which people discover their social power" (Faison, 1984:2).

1: Nonviolent resistance in politics

All state citizens who face oppression have the right to resist unfair and cruel laws. Nonviolence is an alternative tactic to violent resistance. But as mentioned earlier, the state monopolizes violence, so what is the role of nonviolence in the state authority? In reality, state policy deals with violence more than nonviolence. The deep relationship between force and state authority is known. Therefore, the state authority derives force, threat and coercion from violence in order to implement many of its policies, especially when it faces oppositions and demonstrations. "All observers said that, compulsion, intimidation and violence have been and still are a very large and perhaps predominating element in the state, and especially in the political government" (Gregg, 1958: 103). The citizens of the state who face cruel practices find themselves with the choice of submission or resistance. Therefore, if governments open the space for nonviolent demonstrations, they are more likely to be nonviolent than if they are not. When a state allows citizens to show their refusal and opposition towards politics or any oppressed laws, the chances of destructive demonstrations maybe lesser because: 1) the probability of destructive confrontation between citizens and government will be fewer in a nonviolent one. 2) The follower of nonviolent actions is always far away from devastation. 3) The suitable opportunity for citizens and government to practice and learn how to behave in nonviolent actions especially through opposition demonstrations. Though, by comparing the results of permissible organized nonviolent demonstrations by the authority to the violent ones, no one who cares for state and citizen interests can say that random violent demonstrations are better.

2: Moral considerations of nonviolence

Even if people have a right to violent resistance in certain instances, justifying violence in all its forms is always difficult because of its ability to leave physical and moral damages. The power of nonviolence highlights the importance of moral considerations to refuse unjust practices towards oppressed people. As we mentioned before nonviolence civil disobedience means a moral obligation to refuse to cooperate with unjust social system Thus while violent resistance is often considered immoral, nonviolent resistance has moral characteristics. This becomes clear when it advocates its followers to be pacifists and engage in educational projects promoting human

cooperation. Nonviolent resistance never asks its adherents to commit any violent actions towards government or any public property. This type of moral resistance appears clearly in the African American civil rights struggle. In his article "Why nonviolence", Irwin and faison added, "Nineteenth century Americans agitating for the abolition of slavery were among the first to articulate ‘moral resistance”. Likewise, many activities of the civil rights and anti-Vietnam War movements, such as sit-ins, marches, draft refusal, the blockage of ammunition shipments, and obstruction at induction centers, reflected this outlook, shared by many individuals pacifists" (Irwin & Fasion, 1984: 3).

Since moral obligation exists between the two groups non-African Americans and African Americans, the winner will be the possessor of these morals. Thus, nonviolent struggle demands peaceful resistance and aims to avoid destruction, killing, insult and oppression; the main slogan for nonviolent struggle is moral resistance. This moral consideration was one of the main reasons that united whites and African Americans alike to bring changes to legislation and societal institutions. According to Irwin and Faison (1984: 4), the enormous impact of the civil rights movements affected both African Americans and whites through the legal and institutional changes it brought about, and it created a body of people with a shared moral and political background from which they could move on to challenge other injustices like the Vietnam war, imperialism, poverty, and sexism.

The main value in nonviolent resistance is that it comes from an inner feeling of peaceful resistance and thus it is not just a reactive response. Nonviolence also comes from moral inner attitude towards the opponent, which offers the opponent the opportunity to rethink of his or her violent behavior. In this way, it is possible that the opponents will be nonviolent in their responses, because the adherents of nonviolence reflect their own positive morals on their opponent. "The inner attitude is more important than the outer act. Though, it is vitally important to be true to oneself, to make one’s outer conduct a true reflection and expression of one’s inner state" (Gregg, 1960: 50).

Furthermore, when policemen and soldiers commit violent act towards people they justify their actions as obeying orders. Here and in obeying orders we cannot accuse these policemen or soldiers that they committed violence against other people. But

perhaps this soldier is praiseworthy by his or her leader when he or she has done their duty. In contrast, the victims of these acts (duties) see these duties as violent ones. According to Ted, we cannot say this against the man who sets a bomb. More simply we cannot condemn him for not having been unreflective or, as might be said, mindlessly obedient. We could only condemn him, it seems, if we took him/her to be praiseworthy, or possibly praiseworthy. It is like the soldier who kills the peasants without reflecting on what he does and simply because his officer has given him an order. We certainly do not regard either the automatic soldier, or the soldier with a single moral principle about obeying all commands, as praiseworthy (Hondrich, 1976: 54). In this context, nonviolent resistance seeks to help the oppressor to re-establish his or her moral balance on a level higher and more secure than that from which he or she first launched his or her violent attack (Gregg, 1960: 50). Therefore, this point refers exactly to two directions:

1) Nonviolent strategy can develop citizen moral considerations and realization to avoid harming policemen, military, solider or others who may be just normal people doing their jobs.

2) It can help the policemen, militant and soldiers to re-establish their moral considerations towards oppressed people who merely ask for their rights. In specific situations, these policemen or forces could see citizen's nonviolent actions as fair demands. Thereby, nonviolent behavior may effect these forces to refuse and continue their violent or brutal behaviors even they will loose their praiseworthiness or jobs. Perhaps this becomes true if nonviolent moral considerations succeeded to convince them to re-establish their moral considerations. Methods of nonviolence, which give us the time to plan, think, organize and avoid harming people can, open the gates for better results to solve domestic conflicts.

3) Nonviolence moral methods can rescue people's rights and explore violent behavior. There is some confusion in terms of when and in what contexts the people who carry out state actions can be considered violent or nonviolent. Thus, governments can see nonviolent demonstrations as violent actions, whereas people see the reflective action from policemen to these protests as violent. Thus, we cannot always have access to specific measurement or certain criteria about who commits violence or nonviolence. According to Bingham (1970: 117), the use of force in

demonstrations depends on who is evaluating the reasonable necessity or the legitimacy of the use of force. If policemen beat a demonstrator into unconsciousness while breaking up a peace demonstration, they may claim that they used only such force as was necessary to make an arrest. However, an objective outsider would see it as excessive force and therefore violence and the demonstrator would consider the entire police action, even with respect to those not roughly handled, as police violence. A moral consideration succeeds to rescue people's rights by revealing regime brutality and being away from legitimate violent risk. In India, for instance, the British colonizers were very violent in their response to demonstrations, as were the American in their response to civil rights movements. Though, both chose to stay with nonviolence because it made a moral claim and revealed state violence, which was often hidden in structural and institutional violence. If Gandhi and King took the violent path, they risked legitimizing violence and delegitimizing their own movements, which they believed were morally right.

Moral behaviors leave the opportunity for nonviolent struggle to be practiced by all levels of society: men, women, children, young, old, individuals, groups or any level of society category. This drives us to say that the secret for nonviolence victory is its moral considerations.

3: Efficiency of nonviolence as a tactic

"Understanding the methods of nonviolence could make one appreciate its strategy and tactics; nevertheless, not all the people believe in the efficacy of nonviolence, many people who read about nonviolence are still skeptical of its effectiveness, despite the fact that, under Gandhi's leadership, it won freedom for India" (Gregg, 1960: 113). This compels us to ask how we can determine the efficiency of nonviolence as a tactic. I argue that this efficiency appears through a comparison of the method and results of nonviolence in relation to other tactics such as violence. Firstly, the nonviolent method shows its efficiency through implementation. It costs less than any other kind of tactics, such as violence or wars. We can consider this in relation to the destruction of property. "Effective use of property destruction is… only likely where haphazard (random) and undisciplined destruction is avoided and any destruction is completely open and subject to careful and deliberate control" (Irwin & Faison, 1984: 9). There are thus only certain conditions under which the destruction

of property is a productive tactic. Likewise, according to Gene Sharp (1973: 610), "property destruction can, in certain circumstances be an effective tactic but must always be evaluated according to whether it will be understood primarily as a challenge in human terms by human beings to other human beings" Sharp (1973: 610). In this regard, nonviolence is more effective because it justifies resistance in relation to human relationships.

Nonviolent struggle has been used in many places in the world and thus shows great victories. According to Gregg (1960: 9), the heroic, although unanticipated, nonviolent resistance against the Nazis in Denmark and Norway, and by smaller groups in France, the Netherlands and in Germany itself, was such a demonstration. So has been the struggle in South Africa against unjust law, the winning of its freedom by the new nation of Ghana, and the success of Montgomery experience in America (Gregg, 1960: 9). These heroic victories bear witness to the effectiveness of nonviolent struggle. Nonviolence efficiency appears in several directions as follows:

First, the success of the strategy in removing dictators not only weakens the regime but also empowers the oppressed people who always feel that they are victims and powerless. By nonviolence, they can practice to gain freedom and to ask for equal opportunities by their own efforts. Therefore, the society, which practices nonviolent struggle to gain its goals, becomes capable of dealing with different kinds of problems that it may face in the future “The effect of nonviolent struggle does not only weaken and remove the dictators but also empowers the oppressed." (Sharp, 1993: 66).

Second, in fact the main efficiency of nonviolent weapon is that “it can cut without wounds". In this context, it can endure the suitable defense for minorities, oppressed, colonized and occupied people who cannot own destructive weapons to defend themselves. Nonviolence efficiency can appear through a comparison of violence wars results by those of nonviolent ones. Thus the differences in people mortality loss can be a very important indication here.

Third, nonviolence has the ability to be a comprehensive method socially, economically, and politically. It can be efficient if used to solve the problem of economic injustice. Gregg (1960:64) clarified that people in India in 1930 used nonviolent struggle to show their economic opposition to the British. Thus, Gandhi at that time marched to the sea to defy the British government. Also, there is the

widespread of salt manufacture in opposition to government salt monopoly. In politics, nonviolent struggle also succeeded to bring about the rights of African Americans to vote in 1964. On the social track, nonviolence can be efficient in bringing about sympathy and union from all society levels and public opinion. The values of respect and charity will spread after and through regain of lost rights though, people will be more united on great values to rebuild their societies in present and future.

E: Conclusion

We cannot understand any concept without reference to its background, especially when there are political concepts. Thus, before adoption of any particular concept, we should understand its relationships to politics, as well as its relationship with state authority and government. Thus, three points arise from this discussion. First, violence has the power to make quick change, because of its threat factor. Second: violence has the ability to make positive and negative changes in the society; this is a fact that cannot be denied historically. Third: both people and governments practice violence and nonviolence, but this depends on their situation, interests and demands. Nevertheless, practices of violence have a deeper relationship with state authority more than that of practices of nonviolence.

However, violence often means the inability to achieve the objectives of persuasion. Thereby the power of nonviolence to convince presents itself as an alternative method to violence. In addition, there are instances in history of nonviolent resistance, where its persuasion, determination, patience, faith, great courage, deep belief and moral behaviors can stand up in front armed militaries. It could be preferable because it avoids harming people who are just doing their jobs especially those who commit violent practices in the name of the state. For instance, there are complicated moral considerations in terms of how we look to people who work in military and police and whose work demands violent duties. Many people look to these duties only as violent duties and not for marinating security or status quo. No one can determine who is right or wrong in this situation. Policemen, military soldiers work and think that they do their best to maintain the status quo. Citizens who demonstrate, resist and challenge government's oppression and policy also think that they are doing the right. In this case, we cannot reach or realize what is the rightness or the wrongness of

violence. In this context, nonviolence can hold the responsibility to lower the degree of this confusion because of its moral considerations. Thus, when people and their government fall in domestic conflict, the nonviolent struggle will be the main tool that reduces the severity of destructive confrontation between them especially when both of them think that they are doing the right thing.

Freedom and lost rights need a lot of courage and sacrifices. Saving souls and property by nonviolent struggle is a great work and a wise struggle. Even violence or nonviolence has the ability to make changes in the society, but both need courage and sacrifice. Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that although nonviolent campaigns had many successes in achieving political, social or economic change, such movements have not always been successful and have at times led to greater suffering and violence at the hands of those in power. In fact, both violence and nonviolence have some characteristics." The threat of violence seems essential to resistance. Nevertheless, there have been instances in history where great courage, deep conviction and a fine cause have prevailed, without violence, against armed might" (Gregg, 1960: 10).

One cannot deny that violence can change things in society for both the good and bad. But in this research we are not in front what is right or wrong. We are in the front to prove that: 1) There is a relationship between violence, nonviolence and state authority**.** 2) Advances for democracy could be nonviolent too. For example," the struggle for democracy in Burma, Belarus, Iran, Tibet and Zimbabwe are examples of nonviolent struggle waged against oppressive regimes for worthy goals, such as those of ending tyranny and bringing peace with justice to the people" (Helvey, 2004: 3).

It is important to say that even other nations succeeded or failed in their violence or nonviolence resistance, we have to learn from their success or failure. Violence and nonviolence uses were and still controversial, oppressed people have to add and improve their resistance struggle according to what is suitable to their abilities, circumstances and political situations. Referring to Fidelis Allen (2009: 3), "In any case, the use of violence or nonviolence as strategies for waging wars, pursing right, resisting oppression and seeking justice has remained highly controversial". Though the most preferable resistance is the one that inflicts on its followers lesser losses of lives.

Chapter IV: Democracy Relationship to Each of Nonviolence and Violence

A: Introduction

In Arab Spring revolutions, people sought after democracy values. But before democratization, people in Arab countries (or, indeed, any other nation), who seek to get rid of their dictatorship regimes, must fully understand democracy relationships with violence and nonviolence; otherwise, they will fail due to death losses, chaos and may bring another dictatorial regime**.** Therefore, this chapter will focus on the relationship between violence and democracy in contemporary politics. People tend to understand violence as contrary to democracy, because democratic theory concerns itself with values like freedom, justice and equality. History suggests that violence is one of the main factors in the creation of democracy, and it is also a prominent tool in the practice of a democratic government. As Little (2005) argues, "the failure to grasp the inherent relationship between violence and democracy has profound implication for the political organization of any society" (Little, 2005::3). Understanding this integral relationship offers an important opportunity for any people seeking after a better future. Likewise, nonviolence has an important relationship with democracy, to the extent that nonviolence can be considered as a method of democracy.

Thus, this chapter will argue that there is a relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy, employing the United States as a case study.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section one defines what democracy is and why democracy is never fully achieved. Section two explores two questions. The first is why people tend to presume that democracies are nonviolent. The second is the ways in which democracy and nonviolence align with each other. In this context, the positive effects of nonviolence in democratic society will be clarified.

Section Three will explain and clarify the ways in which democracy and violence align with each other, which will address six issues:

1. Ways in which democracy and violence align with each other.

2. The notion that democracy follows wars and revolution.

3. When Democracy is achieved, why does violence persist?

4. Does the state monopolize violence?

5. forms of violence had been practiced by democratic state?

6. Problems involved in democracy.

B: Defining Democracy

Governments are institutions that create and implement the policy and laws that guide the conduct of a nation and its citizens. Citizens are those members of political community - town, city, state, or a country who, through birth or naturalization, enjoy the rights, privileges, and responsibilities attached to membership in a given nation. (Harrison et. al, 2009: 8-11). Across the world, types of governments differ from one country to another. Some of them are dictatorial, totalitarian, theocratic, monarchy, or oligarchy, and the meaning of each depends on the way the government rules its citizens and how these citizens choose their governors . "In a monarchy, a member of a royal family, usually a king or a queen has absolute authority over a territory. In an oligarchy, an elite few hold power. Some oligarchies are dictatorships which are ruled by a small group (junta) who have not been elected and may use force to stay in power, such as in Myanmar (previously Burma). In democracy, the supreme power of governance lies in the hands of citizens, such as United States" (Harrison et al., 2009: 13).

Citizens who live under dictatorial governments and who face political violence and oppression often believe that other forms of government, particularly democratic ones, are not violent. For example, in the Arab Spring, many people think that democracy is the magical solution to their problems. However, to those who think that democracy is the solution, it is important to emphasize that “it is not immediately clear where the boundaries lie between democracy and other political organizations or violence or nonviolence" (Little, 2005: 4). Democracy is by now an important and broadly used political concept, even if there are different definitions and opinions about what democracy is.

The origin of democracy goes back to the ancient Greeks. The Greeks used the term demokratia (literally, "people power") to describe some of the 1500 polis ("city-states"; also the root of politics) on the Black and Mediterranean seas (Harrison et al.,

2009: 13). In contemporary times, understandings of democracy changed according to the development of local political situations. Abraham Lincoln gave a basic definition of democracy in the Gettysburg Address (1865), without mention of the word democracy itself. But indirectly, democracy can be clear when he pointed to the people's contribution in his famous sentence "this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and the government: of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth" (Abu kishek et al., 2010: 40). Referring to Harrison. (2009), in democracies, the supreme power of government lies in the hands of citizens. The United States and most other modern democracies are republics, sometimes called representative democracies, in which citizens elect leaders to represent their views (Harrison et al., 2009: 13). In the same way, Spitzer (2002) suggests that democracy means what people want matters. The essence of democracy is the participation of the people in choosing their rulers and the people's ability to influence what those rulers do (Spitzer, 2002: 12).

There are direct and indirect forms of democracy. Janda (1992) suggests that universal participation, political equality and rule of the majority are widely recognized as necessary for democratic decision-making. In small, simple societies, these principles can be met in a direct democracy, in which all members of the group meet to make decisions. Indirect democracy is what is now commonly called representative democracy, where citizens participate in government by electing public officials to make government decisions for them (Janda, et al, 1992: 38-39).

People and government are thus the basic elements of a democratic society; they are the dynamic moving forces who may resort or prefer various forms of violence or nonviolence to prove their goals. This guides us to say that democracy is a concept that is never fully completed because it relies on other political concepts to activate its values. Lowi (2008) identify collective action policy as involving the building, combining, mixing, and amalgamating of the goals of individual and groups (Lowi, et al., 2009: 12). Thus, it can be said that in democratic politics, it can be difficult to place individuals involved in decision-making process along particular goals and preferences; likewise, it is difficult to align citizen's objectives with government interests. Interests and objectives in democratic society impose democracy needs on other concepts. In fact, democracy is a continuous realm of struggle, where its relationships with other political concepts are often not clear.

C: Democracy & Nonviolence

Oppressed people typically seek to bring their lost rights. The consequence and uniformity between nonviolence methods and democratic life do not only grant people a better social change but also a great one.

1. **Why do people tend to presume democracies as nonviolent?**

A democratic government has often been considered as integral to the realization of nonviolence; indeed, nonviolence is integral to the realization of authentic democracy (Martin, 2008: 21). The philosophy of nonviolence that has been developed through much of the twentieth century has made an indispensable contribution to all theories of legitimate revolutionary social change. The implications of nonviolence practices can be an indicator for a democratic society. The tools of nonviolence struggle such as strikes, demonstrations, and other expressions of peaceful oppositions are allowed in a democratic society. This means that there are no contradictions between these two concepts, on the contrary, both have common factors to achieve the other. Rummel who was awarded the Nobel prize in 1996 argues that democracies (1) do not make war on each other, 2) limit bilateral violence, (3) are the least war like, (4) are most internally peaceful, and (5) don't murder their own citizens (Rummel, 1998: 103). These overwhelmingly supported propositions led him to a concluding summary proposition that nonviolence is a method of democracy.

Based on Rummel's previous assumptions, we can adopt the last one, which is related to domestic conflicts. The last assumption says that democratic countries do not murder their own citizens. He defended his assumption by saying that many people were killed in indicated violence and through internal civil wars. He added that governments sometimes murder their citizens more than any outside conflicts and wars. Thus Rummel, brought some evidence from undemocratic countries which committed genocide against their own citizens to prove his assumption. "A million more people were killed in the Taiping Rebellion in China than the ones died in battles in World War I and World War II. Stalin alone is responsible for the murder of millions more than the combat deaths of both world wars together (Rummel, 1997: 104). Rummel here defends democracies by indicating that democracies would be an incredible evidence towards people rights because of its ability to control and reduce the large numbers of victims and collective violence in their domestic conflicts.

Therefore, according to Rummel, the clean hands of democracies from committing domestic genocides encourage people who live in despotic or tyrannical governments to presume democratic countries as inherently nonviolent. While there is a relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy, there are a number of connections between democracy and nonviolence, which may lead people to this conclusion.

2. **Ways in which democracy and nonviolence align with each other**

First: Gene Sharp (1973) asserts that, nonviolent protest and persuasion include a large number of methods, which are mainly symbolic acts of peaceful opposition or of attempted persuasion, extending beyond verbal expression but stopping short of non-cooperation or nonviolent intervention. Among these methods are parades, vigils, picketing, posters, teach-ins, mourning and protest meetings (Sharp, 1973: 117). Consequently, democratic societies accept such types of protests from their citizens. Glen T. Martin (2008: 21) suggests that the "truly democratic societies institutionalize for citizen participation: discussion, public debates, freedom of information, public demonstrations, referendums, election of officials, and both individual and collective forms of action". Therefore, both democracy and nonviolence ask for peaceful protests, which make people think that democracy principles protect and allow people's nonviolent methods**.**

Second: "the number of participation", affects both democracy and nonviolence. For instance, people's participation can determine the results of elections in democratic process; likewise, the more people are involved in nonviolent protest, the more they can influence society. "The numbers of participating activists and the degree of support they receive from the population are among the main factors that nonviolence depends on" (Sharp, 1973: 115). The power of people participation is hence laid in their collective works to reach their targets. Thus, the more the people participate in nonviolence and democratic elections, the more that they have the power to make change in society and politics. Throughout the number of participations, there are two additional points:

The first point could be positive, in the sense that the relationship between democracy and nonviolence is approved by civil society. Nonviolence is an important factor for democratic civil society. In this sense, democratic values such as equality, freedom

and justice are going simultaneously with what nonviolence methods ask for. Also we can see that democratic civil society organizations commonly employ and activate strategies of nonviolence. According to Stephen Zunes, as a result, the best hope for advancing freedom and democracy among oppressed nations of the world comes not from armed struggle and not from the intervention of foreign powers, but from democratic civil society organizations engaged in strategic nonviolence actions" (Zunes, 2009: 8-11). "The objectives of nonviolence generally include freedom and democracy, respect of human rights, and rule of law as objectives of their struggle, thus the "means and ends" of nonviolence and democracy are not only compatible but mutually reinforcing "(Helvey, 2004: 92).

The second point could be a threat factor in the perspective of the democratic regime. For instance, the increasing number of nonviolence participations day after day could be a serious threat in the recognition of the current regime. This becomes true when the grand rule of democracy depends on "people participations". Thus when people participation increases against regime policy, it could be a warning or a threat factor by nonviolence towards regime policy to be changed or abolished. Referring to Gene Sharp, "There should, in fact, be no dismay or surprise at repression: it is often the result of the opponent's recognition that the nonviolent action is a serious threat to his policy or regime" (Sharp, 1973: 110). The success of African Americans civil vote act in 1964 was an example how nonviolence struggle effect and warn the current oppressive policy to be changed.

Thirdly, while nonviolence can be a method of democracy, the transition from the current democratic system to a new one will be safer than the dictatorship regime**.** Actually and everywhere, the process of transition to new authority by violent resistance will hold a high cost and difficulties. For example, many violent revolutions had fallen in devastating confrontation between people and their current system when both people and government choose violent ways in the transition of authority. In the Arab Spring, for instance, the revolutionary people in Libya paid a high cost in souls and property when they determined to change the regime and bring a new one. Nevertheless, the cost of loss of souls and property in the Egyptian revolution against the current system was less, because most people try to follow nonviolent and peaceful demonstrations in order to change the system.

The result is that democratic regime comes by people voters and elections. Then if people want to defeat this regime by a nonviolent method, they only gather their efforts, withdraw their voices, proclaim their disobedience and get rid of it. This becomes true because democratic rulers or undemocratic ones cannot rule without the consent and approval of the people. In this context, Helvey added "the ruler can only rule with the consent and cooperation of the people" (Helvey, 2004: 4). In other words, nonviolence strategy has the ability to remove the undesired government and bring another democratic one. According to Fidelis Allen, "Nonviolence has the tendency to topple government and install those who are pro-democracy and popular" (Allen, 2009: 5). In his article violence, nonviolence & reality Spencer Grave clarified that advances for freedom and democracy have been achieved through predominately nonviolent means (Graves, 2005: 15).

The previous information highlights the integral relationship between democracy, freedom and nonviolence. It can lead us to conclude that: 1) nonviolent practices in the society help us to determine if a country is democratic or not. 2) to infer that a democratic country is the one which practices nonviolence strategies to solve domestic conflicts.

D: Democracy & Violence

While nonviolence can be a method of democracy as Rummel assumptions suggest, what is the relationship between democracy and violence? Democracy and violence are two different words in meaning and practice. To reach a better understanding of both, we have to look at and explore the ways in which democracy and violence deal with each other. In fact, from this we can reach a better understanding of their relationship. It can give us an idea to determine where a democratic government stands regarding practice of violent forms. In addition, citizens in "domestic conflicts" can help us to explore and determine if democratic governments prefer violent or nonviolent practices.

1. Ways in which democracy and violence align with each other

Violence can resemble the waves of the sea. Sometimes these waves can be destructive if they are stimulated by other circumstances such as storms. So what is the strength of democracy towards violent waves? Referring to Jenny et al (2011)

democracies have the potential for waves of violence, or even continuously high levels of violence (Jenny et. al, 2011: 23).

This signifies that the nature of violence could be horrific consequences especially when it finds suitable circumstances to grow. The abuse of freedom limits in democratic practices between people and their government opens other doors for waves of destructive violence. For instance, violent and destructive revolutions with misconceptions about democracy freedom limitations and boundaries may lead people to loose their democratic rights more than achieve them. In fact, the moment the mob exploits violence and democratic freedom to achieve its aims; this means that the problems have began rather than stopped. Thereby, the triangle of freedom, violence and democracy can be more destructive than any vicious weapon if they were abused and exploited.

On the other side, when structural and institutional violence grows and flourishes in a democratic state, services and effectiveness of these institutions to state citizens become weaker and wear down. This happens because democratic institutions are created on legitimacy but when violent practices appear, they would reveal this legitimacy. Jenny added that violence interacts perversely with democratic institutions eroding their legitimacy and effectiveness (Jenny et al, 2011: 29). However, violence existence could wear down the efficiency of a democratic institution and this would reflect badly on citizen's rights.

However, why do violent forms appear in a democratic government? Simply, this due to the ability of democratic societies and governments to defend themselves and their interests by relying on violent means.

Democracy as a political concept cannot alone resolve many of the external and internal conflicts. It needs to rely on violent means and tools to defend its values. Iraq and Afghanistan wars and American domestic conflict with African Americans are striking examples how a democratic government could fail in resolving its domestic conflicts if it did not rely on violent means. This pushed Jenny to point out: "the idea of democracy fails to live up to its promise of replacing the violent resolution of conflict with accommodation and compromise, and thereby reducing violence." (Jenny, et al, 2011: 29).

In a nutshell, despite the success and the great manifestation of democratic societies, the facts say that democratic societies still face systematic violation practices and citizens continue to suffer from abuse and limitation of their rights. According to Caldeira, the civil component of citizenship in democratic societies remains seriously impaired as citizens suffer from systematic violation of their rights(Caldeira et. al, 1999: 692) Certainly, violent practices in democratic societies may be less dangerous than dictatorial societies. But one cannot deny that violence exists in both of these societies at different levels and forms.

2. Notion that Democracy follows wars and revolutions

When and where did violence play a historical role in consolidating democracy in United States or other countries? Many reasons force people to revolutions. These reasons differ from one nation to another. They could be economic, political, occupational, justice, or inequality reasons. Thus, oppressed people always find themselves forced to adopt different practices to achieve their rights. Some people violent revolutions succeeded to bring democracy values. In fact, people resorted to means that would rescue them from their bad situation even if this tool was violence. Thus the choice of violence sometimes imposes itself as the only solution which can solve or achieve their targets. Nobody can deny its threat force in making changes on oppressive politics or changing the regime itself. As a result, one of violence successors through history is bringing democracy. Mary H. Moran (2006) asserted, "The successors to the widespread of violence, we often imagine, is democracy" (Moran, 2006: 1).

The American civil war was the most violent war in American history. The war influenced the future of American's life at different levels economically or politically. According to Alan Brinkley (2007), more than 600,000 Americans died in the Civil War, a level of casualties almost equal to the total of casualties of all United States other wars combined. However, the war had many other effects on the character of the nation. It helped strengthen the role of government and it was a part of a worldwide movement in the nineteenth century to create a large consolidated nation (Brinkley, 2007: 367-380). By the same token, Tilly (2005) similarly suggests that "surges of democratization often follow violent interstate wars, Civil War and revolutions. Cases to point include the partial democratization of Switzerland after Civil War of 1847, of

the United States after the Civil War, of France after the Commune of 1871, and of Japan and Germany after World War II" (in Grave, 2005: 36).

As a result, the American civil war between the north and the south is very important evidence to the birth of American democracy. Differences that grew up between democratic and republic parties drew the nation to the deadly Civil War. It is worth noting here that the foundation of the rules of democracy and abolishment of slavery cost the nation over 600,000 killed citizens. It can be stated that the most violent War in American history reshaped American democratic future.

However, to avoid making a general statement that the foundation for democracy can always be violence; Spencer Graves criticizes the narratives that pointed out that the civil war brought democracy. He argues that nonviolence brings democracy in the process; it has identified a problem with the dominant narrative of the founding of American democracy. He asked, "Is the American revolution really the only major violent revolution or independence struggle in the record of history to have substantively advanced freedom and democracy? He goes on to conclude that, violence itself appears to threat civil society and thereby democracy itself" (in Graves, 2005: 27). Grave goes on to clarify that the history of advances towards freedom and democracy seem to coincide with advances in the civil society. Therefore, if the dominant narrative of the American Revolution is correct, this narrative attempts to glorify that violence actually threatens democracy itself, because war and violence weaken civil society and freedom. By the same token, Grave tries to point out that bringing democracy cannot only be by violent means but also by nonviolent ones. Moreover, violence threatens democratic society instead of building it.

3. When Democracy is achieved, why does violence persist?

The inherent relationship between any authority and force can help us understand why democracy needs to be achieved through force. In fact, a democratic government needs the force to implement its politics as any other government in the world. Unfortunately, this force is derived in some democratic states from violence as a process of ruling people. Here, force can be considered as the key answer to violence Democracy relationship. As Little mentioned, "the state legitimates the use of force as a key ingredient in its authority" (Little ,2005: 2).

Democratic states cannot deny their need for force to impose rules and policy. They often resort or sometimes prefer the use of violent force to impose their willpower. According to Hannah Arendt, violence is the most characteristic concept of any authority (Arendt 1970: 33). However, it is not strange for us to say that democratic governments need violence force to practice, exercise or impose its rules. Little (2005:4) mentions that democratic institutions have always relied upon the use of violence (or the ability to use it) as a mean of exercising their authority.

4. Does the state monopolize violence?

In democratic processes, people give the authority to the rulers through elections, which is upheld through force. The monopoly of force here means the monopoly of violent force. However, it allows their citizens to use force in order to defend themselves but in narrow cases.

According to Weber, the state is that entity which "upholds the claim to the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force in the enforcement of its order". Weber's conception of the state as holding a monopoly on force has figured prominently in philosophy of law and political philosophy in the twentieth century. Weber adds that the state is the source of legitimate physical force. The police and the military are its main instruments, but this does not mean that only public force can be used: private force (as in private security) can be used too, as long as it has legitimacy derived from the state (in Daves, 1971:29). The state legitimacy of using force and domination gave it the freedom to use violent force in order to employ politics and economic resources according to its targets.

What is strange is that when a democratic system had been chosen by the people, why is there a need for violence? Referring to Mary Moran, "democracy is a system in which rulers are freely chosen by their people and in which every one is allowed to voice their opinion and concerns. If such conditions exist, what need is there to resort to violence?" (Moran, 2006: 1). We are told that violence is a destructive force and its use and targets are temporary. However, why do people and government prefer or resort to violence? Here we can say that both resort to violence because they cannot overlook its ability to maintain status quo and keep things the same. Also people who are in power prefer violence immediate solutions and implications to maintain their situation and targets. According to Hannah Arendt, people resort to violence because

of its destructive force and immediate implications (Arendt, 1970: 57). Indeed, violence and democracy are difficult to be gathered in one sentence but the reality of their relationship imposes itself. Without doubt, there are common factors that gather these two different concepts. One fundamental basis of democracy is its ability to secure citizens freedom, justice and equality. Indeed resorting to violence in many civil wars and revolutions was in order to secure people freedom and equal rights. For example in Tunis revolution, Mohammad Bou-Azizi resorted to set himself on fire in a violent way; his act became an incentive to the outbreak of the Tunisian revolution in particular and wider Arab Spring in general. He burnt himself to show his opposition of the current system. This action has exploded the revolution, which called for democratic authority and change of the current regime. Thus, peoples' rights are the fundamental contributors to both ends of violence and democracy. Here we can find ourselves in front of something called democratic violence. Ted Honderich says that, "some violence, as we have just seen, may serve the ends given in the fundamental argument for the practice of democracy. Here, it is mistaken to find conflict. Some of the violence in question, further, has other features of the same importance. It may be named democratic violence" (Honderich,1976: 115).

Otherwise, violence results sometimes could justify its causes, especially when it succeeds to achieve some targets and objectives. This success makes its user move away from reluctance in practicing it as an efficient weapon. According to Hannah Arendt (1970), violence, which is instrumental in its nature, is perceived to be realistic when it reaches the end that will justify it (Arendt, 1970: 72). Indeed, the main point here is: what are the political violence borders in the practices of a democratic state? Is there a justification to use some political violence in the state? Ted asserts that: some political violence could be justified (Honderich, 1976: 109). In fact, even democratic principles of freedom and equality attract people's life, but this attraction cannot delete the integral relationship with violence. This means that the dream of democratic life cannot be fully achieved. Thereby democracy violence relationship imposes itself on democratic state citizens and on the dream of the people who sought after democratic life.

In this context Keane John (2004) added that "the old rule that mature democracies do not fight each other certainly applies, but that doesn't mean that democracies can forget about violence, or consider it marginal phenomena" (John, 2004: 18). To be

fair towards these claims, we have to mention some forms of violence, and demonstrate how democratic governments practice it.

5. Forms of violence had been practiced by democratic state

The first chapter is characterized by a presentation of forms of violence. Unfortunately, these forms are not away from democratic state practices. Debora describes structural violence in America as follows: The unequal access to resources, political power, education, health care or legal standing are forms of structural violence. There are many examples of this when inner-city children have inadequate schools while others do not, gays and lesbians are fired for sexual orientation, laborers toil in inhumane conditions, and people of color endure environmental toxins in their neighborhoods, so structural violence exists (Winter & Leighton, 2001: 1). Places of structural violence can appear where people are prevented and denied equal access to society resources. African Americans who are deprived of many of society resources resemble the main evidence to structure violence. They were racially segregated, excluded from economic resources, and politically prevented from their basic political and voting rights. Morris (1984) said: "by the 1950s, southern whites established a comprehensive system of domination over African Americans. African Americans were controlled economically, politically and personally" (Morris, 1984: 1). The domination on African Americans was not from white's society alone, but United States government also was involved in this oppressive domination by practicing structural and institutional violence to prove these three dimensions which Morris described as a tripartite system of racial domination. From racial practices and inequality practices against African Americans, the ability of democratic states to practice direct or indirect structure violence is clear. Deborah confirms this point by indicating that structural violence is problematic in and of itself, but it is also dangerous because it frequently leads to direct violence. Those who are chronically oppressed are often, for logical reasons, those who resort to direct violence. For example, cross-national studies of murder have shown a positive correlation between economic inequality and homicide rates across 40 nations (Unnithan & White, 1982). In the U.S., racial inequality in wealth is correlated with murder rates (Blau &Golden, 1986; in Winter & Leighton,2001: 2) however, when the state is implicated in violence forms, it cannot prevent its forms from spreading in the society.

Jorgen Moltmann describes "structural violence" as the following: There are political and economic structures, which are unjust because they are used to enforce the domination of human beings over human beings, the exploitation of human beings, and the alienation of human beings from one another. Within these structures, violence is practiced, not directly and personally, by way of laws and prices. Through structure of this kind, violence is legitimated. Through them, violent death is spread (Moltmann, 1996: 95, in Martin, 2008: 19).

Moreover, institutional violence can be understood as the second face of structural violence. American's government had been involved in this form through the aggressive practices against African Americans. For instance, through black's civil rights movements (1950-1960), democratic public safety Commission Eugene "Bull" Connor in Birmingham lets loose vicious dogs and turns skin burning fire hoses on black nonviolent demonstrations. In 1954, and to prevent desegregation of a little school, democratic Alabama Governor George Wallace stood in front of Albama school loss in 1963 and thundered "segregation now, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever. Individuals also shared their governments to complete the circle of institutional violence and segregation “democrat Georgia Governor Lester Maddox notoriously brandished ax handles to prevent black from patronizing his hamburgers restaurant" (Rice, 2009:1). These cases prove how different kinds of institutions play together to isolate African Americans from the American's society by violent practices.

All men are created equal is the most famous sentence in American constitution. However, why does death penalty reveal the unequal punishments in courts between African Americans and Whites? How do racial bias and discrimination against African Americans who were created from past decades, still translate into institutional violence in state courts and jails? Referring to Rachel, brutalizing violence does not only come from prisoners, but also from prison guards and officials who become the daily agent of racism and inhumanity. Institutionalizing the use of violence can never solve the problem that violence has created in our community or in our world; violence is the beginning of the problem, but not the solution to it (Kamel & Kerness,2003:12). In the realm of American law, Derrick Bell refers, " the death penalty, especially, as a punishment in which those being executed or awaiting execution are poor, over half are racial minorities, and most were sentenced to death

for a crime of white victim. He refers to another law review which asserts that most statistics show where a victim is white, the odds of receiving death penalty are four times greater for a black defender than for a white one" (Bell.2004: 24).

The proportion of African Americans in jail would greatly out number the occurrences of black crime. He cites a time when police forces as racist; when officers failed to break up a fight accused of "hoping black people would just kill each other off", the police "stop and frisk" more black people than white people because of racism (McWhorter, 2008: 21). By midyear of 2003, 12.8% of black males were in jail compared to 3.8% Hispanic males and 1.6% of white males. (in Weatherspoon, 2006: 16).

Professor Hugo Bedav (2010) wrote in the " The Case Against the Death Penalty": The Death penalty system in US is applied in an unfair and unjust way against people, largely dependent on how much money they have, the skill of their attorney, race of the victim and where the crime took place, people of color are far more likely to be executed than white people, especially if the victim is white (Bedav-American Civil Liberties Union, 2012). The death penalty is racially divisive because it appears to count white lives as more than black lives. "Before 1930 and the end of 1996, 4220 prisoners were executed in the United States; more than half (53%) were black. Our nation death rows have always a disproportionately large population of African American, relative to their percentage to the total population. (Between 1930 and 1976, 455 men were executed for rape, 405 of whom [90 percent] were black.) A higher percentage of the African Americans who where executed were juveniles; and the rate of execution without having one's conviction reviewed by higher court was higher for black (Bowers, legal homicide 1984; Streib, Death Penalty For Juveniles 1987; in Bedav, 2012). According to these statistics of disparities between African Americans and whites, institutional violence is easy to grow against African Americans in a democratic state where these statistics do not make any change in the penalty of death.

6. Problems involved in democracy

Democracy itself is not self-evident, and this is what people who sought after democratic life miss to realize and understand. What are the problems of democracy? Democracy presents itself as the savior of people rights and a sponsor of human rights

and equal distributions of opportunities. This is the bright face of democracy; the dark one that we cannot see is the one when such rights are practiced they become problematic. Thus democracy is an inherently controversial concept. However, people look to it as a liberator from their problems. Consequently, is this true? What is the dark side that people cannot notice about democracy? Democracy practice is integral to other political concepts such as violence. Thus, democracy is not the magic solution to people's problems; on the contrary, its practice includes many difficulties and problems. Bourke, for instance, describes the disability of democracy as follows: "We simply cannot call upon democracy to fix the situation since democracy itself is half of the problem" (Bourke,2003: 302). Bourke wants to challenge the piety with which the discourse of democracy is used in contemporary politics. He contends that the unanimity around democracy as the common currency of proper politics should provoke considerable skepticism with regard to its potential to resolve contemporary political conflicts (in Little, 2005: 5)

E. Conclusion

Facts threw their shade on the ground. Facts will change the illusion that we live in. Democracy is a kind of ruling people. This type of government relies on the violent force in order to protect itself from any external or internal threat and to use it as a process of ruling people. However, democracy promises to minimize violence use, but is that true? Democracies actors are justified to defend themselves when they face violence. John Keen, contends that we must deal with violence, thus, when faced with people who simply "want to kill", we are justified in using violent methods. Ultimately, if democracy is preserved or built in their presence, they will have to be arrested or, if they resist violently, dealt with by violence (Keane, 1996: 90). Thus, and according to this point, democracy practices depend on the situation. If the situation is suitable to democratic practices, then democratic ways will be followed. If not, democracy will deal with violence by a violent behavior. Facts about democracy relationship with violence cannot stop the dreams of many nations towards democratic life. In fact, the problem was not in democracy itself which calls for equality, justice and freedom, but the problem is in those authorities or people in power who practice democracy according to their targets.

On the other hand, a nonviolence method can be a suitable way in democracy practices. But when we look to violence forms such as structural and institutional ones, we can realize that a democratic state does and sometimes prefer using violence as a way of controlling people. The mixed relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy makes it difficult to separate between the usage and the integral relationship between these three concepts. However, we find that democratic government monopoly of violence is by legitimizing ways to protect itself and its interests from any imminent threat. Therefore, nonviolence or pure nonviolence can be achieved through people's resistance movements rather than state authority practices. The main problem is that the democratic state is not always just. It can be oppressive and violent towards a particular group. African Americans offer a rich experience in this sense. They resembled a main case of minority who suffered from unjust democratic practices. The American liberal ideals of democracy failed to include African Americans. Chapter Five will present African American resistance right from its early beginnings. It is an important form that exemplifies people's nonviolent resistance towards democracy and violence.

Chapter V: African Americans Experience in Violence, Nonviolence and Democracy

A: Introduction:

African Americans slavery life resembles the real means of human deprivation of their basic needs. They were racially excluded from political, economical and social life. The American democracy values of liberty, justice and equality were applied to the whites American citizens, while African Americans were deprived of all their basic rights. An African American has the moral courage to stand in front of this contradiction and offer nonviolent struggle as a main weapon to make a social change. The nonviolent protests, campaigns and marches, which were led by Martin Luther King Jr. and black civil rights movements, imposed their force on American democratic government to grant African Americans equal rights as whites' citizens. The justification of black's revolt is that democracy values call for equal opportunity between African Americans and whites. This becomes a visible fundamental contradiction at the heart of the American democracy. Slavery was started in Virginia shores in 1619 and continued its brutal practice until it was abolished in 1865. But racial segregation and discrimination remained to dominate blacks' life even in democratic era. Without doubt, slavery life resembles violent practices against African Americans on two main dimensions: The white's society and the state authority institutions.

Thus, this chapter argues: that the African American struggle from the period of slavery until the success of civil rights movement illustrates the integral relationships between violence, nonviolence and democracy. This will be demonstrated in three main sections: in the first section, there will be focus on slavery life and how African Americans were kidnapped from their original home. Then, a connection is established between black's slavery life and violence to bring to the forefront slavery practices which represent the second face of violence. This section, will address 1) How African Americans try to resist different kinds of oppression by narrow ways 2) The effects of the differences and conflicts between the south and the north regarding slavery abolition 3) The effect of the civil war on African Americans future.

The second section focuses on democracy issues as an opportunity to reflect how it works with African Americans situation. It tries to reflect on how democratic institutions create violent circles around African Americans from different levels. Then there is a focus on how African Americans developed themselves and their organization economically and politically. Then, some factors that hold black's civil rights movements towards success are presented.

In section three, the African Americans nonviolence experience will be utilized to bring a better democratic life in America, which can be highlighted in the following issues: First: African Americans nonviolence opposition. Second: Why Nonviolence had been chosen? Third: The reactions of democratic government towards black's nonviolent protests. From these issues, the tools that democracy relies on through black's nonviolent struggle can be identified.

B: Slavery and violence in America (1619-1865)

By going back to the first arrival of African Americans to America, slavery association with violence, was the main practice towards them in the American society. African Americans occupy an important period in US history. In slavery period, African Americans will, freedom and human rights had been stolen. "The first African to arrive an American shore is James Town, Virginia in 1619. They were brought as slaves against their will, and treated in an inhuman way; they were considered as a thing to be used, not as people to be respected" (Phillips, 1998:2). The influence of slavery violence practices did not stop at this point, but it went on considering slaves as an object to be used." The Negro is not a citizen of the United States; he is merely property subject (a chattel) subject to the dictates of his owner" (Washington, 1986: 6). They were treated as a thing that can be sold or bought. "Upon arrival in America, Africans were sold into slavery at an auction in slave markets. Many were purchased in advance or sold on consignment" (Phillips, 1998: 3).

Regardless of the common points between slavery and violence, we can say that people always condemned and hated slavery for different reasons. But, the main reason for this detestation is its integrated relationship with violent practices. The conditions that brought African Americans from their original home are imaginable. Their kidnap, and purchase in slave markets can be described as the core of violent

practices. "All African slaves who were brought to America had been kidnapped from the west coast of Africa or were sold by neighboring tribes. They were then transported across the Atlantic Ocean in a savage way, chained together, taken abroad cargo ships and packed like animals into small spaces below deck for a two month trip to the New World. Disease and suicide led to high rates of death in some cases reaching around 25 percent" (Phillips, 1998:3).

Racial laws and inequalities are the main evidence of violent practices. As Gandhi defined in chapter one that violence is to coerce somebody to do something he or she does not want to do. The same matter happened when African Americans were coerced to live hard conditions of slavery." During slavery, African Americans were prevented, by law, from learning to read and write. They were forbidden to associate with other Negroes living on the same plantation. Punishment for any form of resistance or complaint about their situations could range from mutilation to death. Families were torn apart, friends were separated and fathers and mothers were sold away from their children" (King, 1964: 27-28).

While African Americans faced slavery brutality, Americans on the next side struggled against British colony and succeeded to get their independence in 1776. Referring to Sami Fink in his book "The Declaration of Independence", he introduced a fundamental change in the view of government. Thomas Jefferson declared that governments were created to serve the people, and could only act with the consent of the people. In other words, it is the emergence and creation of a new democratic government. The declaration consisted of two parts. The preface describes the people's rights and it states that "all Men are created equal" and have the God-given right to "Life, Liberty, and the search of Happiness." The second part declares independence from Britain, and lists the colonies' issues against the British government. (Fink, 2002). By writing the American constitution, it was not the end, but it was the beginning of the struggle on different interpretations of constitution issues. Interpretation around "all men are created equal" goes to ask, “what about men? Is equality exclusive to white men? Or African Americans can be equal with whites and have the same civil rights. However, despite the birth of the new constitution which includes equality for all men whether they are white or African Americans, the power of slaves owners increased. It was developed to own and capture any African-American who could be a slave. "The domination of whites over

African Americans surrounded all the aspects of African Americans' life. The fugitive slave Act, passed in 1793, increased the power of slave's owners. It allowed agents throughout the north to capture any African American they thought he/ she might be a slave. This law led to the widespread abuse of free people being captured in the north and then transported to the south to be sold into slavery "(Phillip, 1998:7). Without doubt and as any other nation who strives for freedom and equality with whites, African Americans did not submit to the white's domination; they tried to resist slavery by the available scarce means.

1. **African American early resistance**

It is strange in any period of history to see people living in oppression and hard conditions without trying to think about resistance. People can use many ways to show their opposition. The resistance and refusal of oppression sometimes comes by what we do, what we say or at the worse situations when we are not allowed to speak we can resist oppression by our hearts. The tools of resistance we resort to depend on available circumstances around us. Through history, the right of resistance makes many nations succeed in their resistance against oppression and occupation whether this resistance is a violent or nonviolent one. Without doubt, African Americans also tried to get rid of oppression by the available means surrounding them. This becomes clear by refusal, escape, or rebellion. "African Americans started their struggle against slavery right from the beginning. They started demanding freedom once they were locked in slave ships. Rebellion was manifested as well the refusal to take slave names and through uprising and escape" (King, 1999: 104).

In 1800 Gabriel Prosser gathered 1000 rebellious slaves outside Richmond; but two Americans gave the plot away, and the Virginia militia stymied the uprising before it could begin. Prosser and thirty-five others were executed. In 1822, the Charleston free black Denmark Vesey and his followers rumored to total 9000 made preparation for revolt; but again word leaked out, and suppression and retribution followed. In 1831, Nat, Turner, a slave preacher; led a band of African Americans who armed themselves with guns and axes and, on a summer night, went from house to house in Southampton Country, Virginia. They killed sixty white men, women and children before being overpowered by state and federal troops. More than a hundred African

Americans were executed in the afternoon. (Brinkley, 2007: 309). These abortive insurrections show how black tried to resist slavery life even they were not successful.

However, slavery practices against African Americans were developed and political life was also developed; the emergence of new parties such as democratic and republic made us think that better conditions in African Americans life could appear. Therefore, what is the role of these two main parties towards slavery issue? In 1831, democrat held their first national party convention. When the French Alexis de Tocqueville visited the United States wrote " The Government of Democracy" in his classic study *Democracy in America* (1835-1840). The Republican Party was formed in 1854 (Brinkley, 2007: 339). As it was known, the Democratic Party had been considered as a supporter of the southern states while Republican Party was affiliated to the northern states. Consequently, conflicts between these two parties were created around different issues. Definitely, the core issue of these conflicts revolved around: union, slavery, need of African Americans for productive labors in southern plantations and at the same time as the need for industrial development in the North.

2. Conflicts between the north and the south around slavery abolition

Conflicts between the south and the north around slavery and economic issues indicated how the American societies went through difficult periods to develop their society. It also indicated that violent conflicts were indicators to the needs of the society to build the basic ideals towards having a democratic life. Therefore, many of the southern states were pro-slavery while the northern people were anti-slavery. For instance, the Democratic Party pushed for the approval of the Kansas – Nebraska Act that was established to spread slavery all over the new states. After the Kansas-Nebraska Controversy and debates around slavery, Kansas was more likely to become a slave state. In this context, anti-slavery act faced high waves of violence. Elijah. P. Lovejoy, a publisher was slain on November 7, 1837 in Alton, Illinois, because he supported abolitionists in the newspaper. The death of Lovejoy aroused antislavery movement throughout the United States (Brinkley, 2007: 358).

The diversity around slavery between the south and the north moved beyond individuals and groups and reached the United States Chamber, where its members practiced violence; each member wanted to prove his ideas. For instance, in May 1856, Charles Summer of Massachusetts- a militant and passionately doctrine

opponent of slavery rose to give a speech entitled “The crime against Kansas." The proslavery senate members attacked Summer at his disk in the Senate Chamber during recess, and beat his head. Then Summer collapsed bleeding and unconscious. He was unable to return to the Senate for four years. Throughout the north, he became a hero, a martyr to the barbarism of the south (Brinkley, 2007: 357-358).

However, conflicts between the south and the north went on concurrently with slavery developments through the supreme courts institutions**.** The Dred Scott Decision, which was issued in 1857 by the Supreme Court, was a major sign of how state institutions participated in making black's life harder. The core of this decision stated that African Americans were not citizens of the United States; it gave constitutional validity for the system of slavery. It is worth noting that Dred Scott was a Missouri slave, once owned by an army surgeon who had taken Scott with him into Illinois and Wisconsin where slavery was forbidden. In 1846 after the surgeon died, Scott sued his master's widow for freedom. After Scot won his freedom, John Stanford, the brother of the surgeon's widow, claimed ownership of Scot. In pursuance to the Supreme Court decision Scot returned to slavery by depending on "Slaves were property". (Brinkely, 2007:360). "Through the Dred Scott Decision, the U.S. Supreme Court gave constitutional validity to the entire system of slavery (Ansbro, 2000: 161).

Some states in the north had forbidden slavery while others allowed it. This confusion produced division and hostility inside the nation. In this context, what had happened produced such deep hostility between the north and the south. However, each section wanted to prove his views; the success of the south would keep slavery and maintain the plantation sector, but abolishing slavery and freeing labor would encourage the development of the northern industry. "Most white northerners came to believe that the existence of slavery was dangerous not because of what it did to African Americans but because of what it threatened to do to whites. At the heart of American democracy, they argued, was the right of all citizens to own property to control their own labor and to have access to opportunities for advancement" (Brinkley, 2007: 370).

3. **The Civil War effects on African American future**

The civil war did not end black's tragedy, but it changed the nature of their slavery life and the nature of forms of violence that they faced. Although, by the end of 1860,

Americans held different points of view and directions, some states in the south seceded from the Union and took part in the civil war (1861-1865). Union, slavery and economy were considered the main reasons for the civil war, but slavery abolition was considered the strongest one. "In his second inaugural address in March 1865, Abraham Lincoln looked back at the beginning of the civil war four years earlier." all knew." he said, that slavery "was somehow the cause of the war" (Brinkley, 2007: 372).

Slavery was abolished in 1863 by the emancipation proclamation, and everywhere else was in December 1865 by the thirteenth amendment. However, abolishing slavery did not mean that African Americans became really free as whites; the laws continued to discriminate against African Americans and imposed slavery life on them. This can be clear through Whites domination. Many white planters wanted to continue slavery in an altered form by keeping black workers legally tied to the plantation. About 186000 emancipated African Americans served as soldiers, and laborers for the union forces. However, mortality rates between African Americans were higher than those for white soldiers, because of diseases and long arduous working hours in unsanitary conditions. In 1864, confederate soldiers killed over 260 African Americans after capturing them in Tennessee. Consequently, the black codes: throughout the south in 1865 and early 1866 state legislation were enacting sets of laws known as the black codes. Some of the codes forbade African Americans to own or lease farms or to take jobs other than plantation workers or domestic servant. (Brinkley, 2007: 377-406)

Different opinions were developed regarding the war as follows: firstly, some considered it as a moral conflict to end slavery. In 1890, Rhodes identified slavery as the central, indeed virtually the only cause of the war. "If negroes had not been brought to America," he wrote, "the Civil War could not have occurred." And because the North and South had reached positions on the issue of slavery that were both irreconcilable and unalterable, the conflict had become "inevitable". Secondly: many writers went beyond moral interpretation and spoke about economic reasons. The idea of the war as an irresponsible economic, rather than moral conflict received fuller expression from Charles and Mary Beard who insisted on "inherent antagonism" between Northern industrialists and Southern planters. Each group sought to control the federal government to protect its own economic interest. Therefore, both groups

used arguments over slavery and states rights largely as smoke screens. (Brinkley, 2007: 372).

However, the reconstruction era after the civil war did not provide African Americans with either the legal protection or the resources to assure them anything like real equality. After getting freedom, African Americans were unable to resist oppression. In 1866, the Ku Klux Klan started to lynch and terrorize African Americans. In conclusion getting rid of slavery did not mean that African Americans got their freedom or achieved their equality or justice, but it marked a major turning point on their future.

C: Democracy, Violence and African Americans Situation

Anyone who reads African American history thinks that abolition of slavery would bring an end to unjust practices against African Americans. In fact, while African Americans were no longer slaves, they were nevertheless subjected to a number of discriminatory laws, politics and practices that limited their opportunities to participate fully in democratic life. For example:" African Americans in the south were denied their rights to vote in elections by literacy laws, poll taxes and white violence" (Colaico,1993: 117). Equally, African Americans were subjected to laws of segregation that were manifested in voting, industry, education and transportations as follows:

1. In industry, they were forbidden from industry works. "When Americans decided to enter the World War II, military industries were built across America. African Americans did not have equal opportunities for employment, as these industries were barred to African Americans" (Gerstle, 2001: 10). According to Wexler Randolph who presented a petition to allow African Americans to take part in defense industries, it was ignored by the federal government. The appeal was for ending discrimination in the defense industries; Randolph decided to organize a mass march of around 50,000 African Americans to Washington in order to protest discrimination in employment and demand more jobs for African Americans in the defense industries (Wexler, 1993: 10). Thus, the circle of preventing African Americans from work was precise and integrated in many directions.

2. In education, segregation played a role too. The Brown v. board of Education showed racial segregation against African Americans even in schools. Referring to Wexler, the Brown case involved Linda Brown, a seven-year-old black third grader. Brown had to walk daily for a long distance to attend her segregated elementary school in Topeka, Kansas. While there was a school very close to her home, it was a white school which she was not allowed to attend (Wexler, 1993:35).

3, In voting, Rebecca asserted that the south faced an array of disproportionate barriers to enfranchisement. The Louisiana literacy test was one of those boundaries to prevent African Americans from their voting right. The test has nothing to do with citizenship and the questions are often confused. Whites were the ultimate judge of whether an answer was correct. The test was directed only to impede black's enfranchisement right. (Onion, 2013)

4. In transportation, African Americans also faced racial segregation. "the first four rows of seats were reserved for whites only, while the last ten seats were for African Americans. The middle seats were considered a "no man's land". Even if the front seats were empty, and black seats were full, black were ordered to keep standing. If a black person was sitting in one of the middle rows, he or she could be ordered by the driver to get up and give the seat to a white passenger (Wexler, 1993: 88).

The strict treatments towards African Americans created in the mind of the reader, an American society, in a period of time that worked together through its individuals, groups and institutions to create structural and institutional violence against them. In fact, the democratic era did not stop racial segregations imposed on African Americans. But it was the most important political opportunity that African Americans depended on to reach their demands. In fact, those in power see democratic values such as justice and equality in different ways. So democracy values never changed randomly, but people in power or governors who practice democracy tried to change these values according to their political situation.

These practices and laws were used to initiate a regime that was justified as "separate but equal", but the reality is that there was no equality involved in separation. "In 1875, the Jim Crow Laws discriminated against black's attendance in not only public schools, but also it spread to the use of facilities such as restaurant, theaters, hotels, cinema and public baths. Trains and buses were segregated and in many states;

marriage between whites and African Americans was prohibited too"(Phillip, 1998: 10). Consequently "in 1896, the U.S Supreme Court issued the landmark," Plessey V. Ferguson" ruling which set the doctrine of "Separate but Equal". On June 7 1896, Homer Plessey, a 30-year-old colored shoemaker, was jailed for sitting in a white car of the East Louisiana railroad. (Wexler, 1993: 6). "After the "Separate but Equal" doctrine was issued, all southern states enforced segregation in all facilities. Public accommodation was strictly segregated and African Americans were barred from white hotels, restaurants and theaters" (Phillip, 1998:15). These laws drove the white society to be more violent towards African Americans under the protection of law.

1. **African American developments**

By the twentieth century African Americans situations were different. Circumstances were changed and new organizations had appeared. This development was strengthened and it pushed African Americans to concentrate their efforts towards having equality with white citizens. "During the 20th century several circumstances changed. Several factors came together making blacks take a new look at them. They began to re-evaluate themselves with new self-respect and a sense of dignity" (Washington, 1986:6). However, circumstances changed through:

The developments of black economic and political situation highlighted their demands for better life and empowered their political rights. Also "the political and economic situation of African Americans improved as a result of the migration of millions of southern African Americans from rural plantations to industrial centers in the north and west." Also colonized people around the globe started to dream of freedom, and the black civil rights movement was seen as part of this world wide movement." (Gerstle, 2001: 271). African American immigration from plantation in the south to the industry world in the north improved their annual income and political attitude that depended on the power of black worker that could have the ability to make change in politics.

The emergence of new leaders after the World War I and during the twentieth century period such as " Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. Du. Bois, Malcolm x and Martin Luther King "(Odeh, 2006: 29) encouraged and developed civil rights organizations marches to freedom and civil rights.

The previous developments strengthened African Americans attitude to counter oppression. They had become more organized to work towards justice through individual leaders, movements and several important organizations such as:

1. The National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People (NAACP). African Americans had become more organized to work towards justice, so NAACP is one organization which reflected this improvement. "This organization which was considered the most powerful civil right organization, was established to fight race prejudice, lynching, and segregation on behalf of African American." (Odeh,2006:34).

According to Colaiaco, it was established in 1908 when a white woman in Springfield claimed to have been raped by an African American man. Although the woman later admitted that a white man had assaulted her, the Springfield mob took to the streets; it killed and wounded a large number of African Americans. (Colaiaco, 1993: 22). This accident shows that even innocent African Americans faced violence from white man. This violence included killing and wounding. Consequently black's suffering evoked two intellectual groups to support them" a group of 60 people issued a call for a meeting to discuss racial justice. This group was comprised of two distinct types of intellectuals: the black elite, including Mary White Ovington, W.E.B.Bois, Ida B. Wells-Barnett and Oswald Garrison Villad, and the white liberals" (Hamby, 1985: 141).

This organization took many roles to advance many rights of African Americans. "The NAACP concentrated on legislative lobbying and court action. Their strategy aimed at gaining African Americans full enjoyment of the fundamental rights of citizenship. The organization struggled for anti-lynching legislation, equal employment opportunities, abolition of segregation and outlawing devices that restricted the right to vote through peaceful and lawful means" (Hamby, 1985: 141). This organization took the mission of ensuring a reinstatement of lost rights for African Americans at different levels; its objectives and goals were to bring equality in politics, education, social and economic levels. It gained many victories one of which was in 1923. "The court overturned murder conviction against a black man, because African Americans had been excluded from jury that had convicted him" (Wexler,1993: 9). It also went through many battles to fight for racial justice and

achieved many victories. Its main strategy was to undermine the legal basis of segregation, through courts.

"During the 1940s and 1950s, the NAACP won a series of important victories. It investigated lynching and segregation in schools. One of The most important successes of NAACP was its success to abolish racial rules in public schools." Also the greatest victory for NAACP was in 1954, when the United States Supreme Court ruled in the Brown v. Board of Education that the racial discrimination in public schools was unconstitutional. This decision overturned the separate but equal doctrine formulated by Plessey v. Ferguson in 1896" (Colaiaco,1993: 20).

It is essential to mention that NAACP in that period depended on the democratic process as the milestone to get African Americans rights. According to Odeh, "in its fight for racial justice, the NAACP concentrated on the democratic process. The legal defense fund of the NAACP, and the black lawyers who worked with them, started the battle against racism in courts. It wanted to guarantee the civil rights of African Americans legally through the court system. However, in the southern states, racism was given legal support, which made many American citizens uncomfortable (Odeh, 2006: 37).

2. The Panther party was considered a very important one at that time. According to Debbi, the Black Panther Party (BPP) was a progressive political organization that stood in the vanguard of the most powerful movements for social change in America since the Revolution of 1776 and the Civil War: that dynamic episode generally referred to as the Sixties. This party promoted the revolutionary agenda and called for black's freedom, justice and equality (Debbi, 2004: 1). However, it is necessary to mention that despite the hard work of this party, it couldn’t achieve by its revolutionary agenda what civil rights organizations achieved by nonviolence. Later on, different black organizations appeared with different names such as: Students Nonviolent Coordination Committee (SNCC), Alabama Christians for Human Rights (ACHR), Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Protest (BSCP), and the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA). The emergence of these organizations was not random; it was strategic and depended on many factors.

2. Factors that Supported the Success of Black Organizations

Many factors helped African Americans to achieve their rights, but the main factors were the following: At first, it was the Cold War and the American claims of democracy through the world. "During the Cold War era many groups and organizations wanted to put democratic ideals into practice, especially in the competition against Communism. They wanted to show that the American way of life was superior, and this meant that segregation was destroying the image of American democracy" (Odeh, 2006: 37). It was known that democracy rights were for all U.S citizens, so the denial of blacks' rights in democracy practices was the main target that supported these movements in their struggle. Therefore, at that period, America was torn between two conflicts. The first one was internal with African Americans and the second one was external with Communism. Thus, in order to strengthen its position against communism, America had to end its internal conflict. In addition, putting America between these two conflicts was a strategic move by these organizations because in a way or another it forced the United States to respond gradually to blacks demands. Blacks movements and organizations knew that one of democracy main values is to distribute equal opportunities in education, economy or politics for all. Thus, they caught the first step and tried to put democracy values into practice by working legally through courts and other institutions.

In this context, Myrdal study was an important study that talked clearly about these contradictions. The Swedish sociologist went after every aspect of black-white relationships. He challenged U.S to get rid of racial bias. Myrdal sated that, the American dilemma of his time referred to the co-existence of American liberal ideals of democracy and equality and the miserable situation of African Americans. On one hand, American creed is the belief that people are created equal and have human rights. On the other hand, African Americans were treated as an inferior race and were denied numerous civil and political rights (inColaiaco, 1993: 93).

Second: the struggle in Vietnam supported these organizations for their liberation movements. It held up its forces to encourage these movements to make possible changes in the policy of the cruel system. The struggle in Vietnam gave these movements the courage to struggle even in a nonviolent way. They reached to a fact that this system can be faced, changed or ended. In short, the fear barriers from

American cruel system had been broken through Vietnam's liberation struggle. According to Marcus (2005) "the success of the Vietnamese liberation Struggle could give the signal for the activation of such liberation movements in other parts of the world. The war perhaps is a turning point in the development of the system, and perhaps the beginning of the end" (Marcuse, 1967).

Third: Martin Luther King who led many of these organizations across discriminations and segregation years, succeeded to reach the right to vote and the access to public facilities. However, King was born on January 15, 1929 in Georgia to a black middle class family. From his birth in 1929 until his assassination in1969, six presidents were elected in the United States. They began with Herbert C. Hoover in1929 and ended with the president Lyndon Johnson in 1969. Nevertheless, through the election of the previous presidents, King and his nation were not allowed to participate in this democratic life until the success of the nonviolence civil rights act in (1964-1965). In fact, King's importance appeared through highlighting nonviolence strategy that granted his nation the power of confrontation with whites and advancement of the causes towards democratic participation. In addition, he went over the previous advances for freedom such as the Nat Turner rebellion the results of which were destructive, and he decided to abandon all types of violent resistance. During 1950s- 1960s, King participated personally in different methods of nonviolent struggles such as, sit-ins, marches, protests and passionate speeches.

The guidance, support and inspiration of King made him a very important factor in the success of civil rights organizations. He did not only adopt the nonviolent strategy but also he considered it as a political struggle. Referring to Krzysztof Brzechczyn (2004) "King distinguished three kinds of possible attitudes: acquiescence, violence and nonviolent resistance. He argued that acquiescence is just a silent agreement and acceptance of an unjust situation. However, an uncontrolled outbreak of violence is not a solution because it creates more problems than it solves" (Brziechczyn, 2004: 129-131). Thus, King argued that," nonviolence is a powerful and a just weapon. It is a unique weapon in the history, which cuts without wounding and ennobles the man who wields it… it could win victories without losing wars, and so became the triumphant tactic of the Negro revolution" (King, 1964: 12).

By using nonviolent struggle, King tries to maintain the thirteen, fourteenth, and fifteen amendments in U.S. constitution that were passed by Congress in 1865-1869 and ratified in 1865-1870. "The Thirteenth amendment represented a more thorough and permanent change by abolishing slavery throughout the United States. The Fourteenth amendment declared that former slaves were U.S. citizens with equal civil rights. The Fifteen amendment affirmed that Americans of all races possessed the same right to vote." (Aboukishek et. al., 2010: 41). However African Americans could not tolerate more discrimination. Thus nonviolent methods towards any kind of injustice and discriminations in the society became peaceful protests. "December 5, 1955 marked the first day of the Montgomery bus boycott. Upon hearing the call of the black leaders for one day bus boycott, thousands of Montgomery African Americans did not ride the city buses that day" (Wexler,1993: 70).

D: Democratic Society Reaction towards African American's Nonviolence Resistance

African Americans integrated themselves in democracy despite the fact they were excluded from it. To prove this, they used the power of nonviolent method to make real changes in the society. African Americans learned how to face violent forces with nonviolent forces. "When, for decades, you have been able to make a man compromise his manhood by threatening him with a cruel and unjust punishment, and when suddenly he turns upon you and says:" punish me. I do not deserve it. But because I do not deserve it, I will accept it… so the world will know that I am right and you are wrong" (King, 1964: 16).

On the second hand, nonviolent method has the ability to bring public opinion support**.** King always tried to gain the support of the public opinion especially through the media. He knows the impact of the public opinion and the media on the government. He understood how the government depends on public opinion in the elections. "People who rejected the use of violence could gain public opinion support and were seen as equal with their prosecutor. The civilized world supported their fight and their rights" (Brzechczyn, 2004: 133). However, the media have the power to make change in public attitudes towards African Americans goals. King was awake for the role of the media in gathering internal and external world sympathy towards nonviolent struggle. Thereby, he said "it is demonstrated by African Americans

forcing their oppressors to commit brutality openly, exposing them to public view through the media" (Calicano,1993: 141). By exposing the brutality of government actions in front of media, King tries to tell us two important matters about American democracy. The first one is the relationship of democratic government with violence and unjust actions towards black's peaceful protests. The second matter is that King sought to declare the determination of African Americans to get their rights by advocating democracy through nonviolent resistance. Relying on this context, we can say that African Americans proved that nonviolence is more effective to gain democratic rights. According to Penile Joseph, African Americans militants set out to reshape American democracy (Joseph, 2009: 1006).

Undoubtedly, implementing nonviolence will be the tool that examines the claiming of democracy in America. The more the society is democratic, the more it can solve its domestic conflicts nonviolently. African Americans took the matter of democracy seriously to the degree that they went to established freedom schools to teach them the essentials of democracy. "Robert Moses, the Program Director of the freedom project, stated that the main goals of the project were to register black voters and establish freedom schools to teach them the essentials of the Democratic Party to challenge the white democratic delegation" (Colaiaco, 1993: 109). Consequently, African Americans nonviolent power to regain their rights depended greatly on the way they learned about their democratic rights. "Black power transformed struggles for racial justice by altering notions of identity, citizenship, and democracy" (Joseph, 2009: 1003). Other parties' tried to highlight the revolutionary violence such as Panther party, but the public atmosphere still supported the nonviolent one and succeeded through it. "While most black power organizations retained the right to self-defense, only a small number of groups, most notably the Black Panther Party, openly advocated proactive revolutionary violence" (Joseph, 2009: 1004).

Consequently King and his nation concentrated and directed their efforts in the right direction. By comparing King nonviolent struggle to Malcolm X method, we can explore how King emphasized that both white and black should live together in one democratic society. To ensure this, he declared that the nonviolent struggle is used against the segregation system in the society but not against the white people themselves." The enemy the Negro faced was not the individual who had oppressed him but rather the evil system which permitted that individual to do so" (King, 1964:

24). This attitude gave him more popularity in public opinion more than other black leaders such as Malcolm X. In fact, Malcolm X opted for violence to face violence which led him to be less popular. Many points of view were formed regarding Malcolm X and Martin Luther King; regardless of the success of one more than the other, what is surprising is that both faced assassination. This leads us to conclude that the one who adopts struggle whether its violent or nonviolent in nature shall face the same fate in a democratic state.

In fact, democracy gives citizens the rights of speech, freedom, peaceful protests and campaigns. Thereby, when a state claims with an iron hand nonviolent protests democracy and rules, this will make us suspicious of its democratic values. To prove this point, let us see how the democratic government faced African Americans nonviolent protests.

1. African American nonviolent opposition

Nonviolent opposition differs from country to another; it varies between sit-ins, campaigns, demonstrations and others. These different kinds of opposition in blacks case take the shape of peaceful and unarmed protests, which draw respect and sympathy from the public opinion and freedom liberation movements in the world. Referring to Marcuse, another form of student opposition was that of the famous teach-ins, sit-ins, be-ins, and love-ins. It expresses fusion of political rebellion and sexual-moral rebellion that is an important factor in the opposition in America. It finds its most visible expression in unarmed demonstrations (Marcuse, 1967). It is the basic right of the citizen in democratic society to oppose the current system peacefully and in a democratic way.

2. **Why nonviolence?**

In fact, nonviolence was more effective because it opened the opportunity for us to see State Violence. The period of nonviolent struggle was the period of peaceful opposition of the current system in order to make better changes in the society towards oppressed people or to change the current system into a better one. According to Marcuse "What is the target of the opposition? This question must be regarded with extreme importance, for we are dealing with opposition of a democratic state. It is an opposition against the majority of the population, including the working class. It is an

opposition against the system's ubiquitous pressure, which by means of its repressive and destructive productivity, degrades everything, in an increasingly inhuman way. (Marcuse, 1967.

Opposition to the cruel current regime can come from different levels in the Blacks society. It can come from regular average people, university students, as well as civil rights movements. The unification of these efforts would draw attention to their demands that need to be fulfilled. Also, this opposition can be used as a pressure factor to reveal the real claim of democracy. Opposition can be a helping factor in bringing about the desired changes in the society. Marcuse stated that opposition to the system as such was set off first by the civil rights movement and then by the war in Vietnam. As part of the civil rights movement, students from the North went to the South in order to help African Americans register for the vote. Then, they saw for the first time how this free democratic system really looks. How murders and lynching of African Americans go unpunished though the criminals are well known (Marcuse, 1967). However, the brutality of the system appears when the confrontation with the opposition will happen. The truth of the American democracy claim depends on the ways that the system decided to use in order to face nonviolent opposition.

3. **The reaction of democratic government towards African Americans nonviolent protests**

While nonviolent resistance showed police and state brutality, it also revealed structural and institutional violence. However, let us see how democrat state forces dealt with blacks nonviolent protests:

First: Police racist reactions towards blacks protests. According to Bailey, nonviolent actions required great courage because they were likely to incite violent retaliation from the police or even bystanders. They also required powerful self-control for if the protesters were to succeed in their aim, they had to remain peaceful in the face of violent retaliation. When black activists staged sit-in at segregated lunch counters in the United States in the early 1960s, they were cursed, spat upon and physically brutalized (Bailey, 1977: 159). Dogs and high pressure hoses were used to disperse these demonstrators. "On April 7, 1963, the campaign stirred the racist violence necessary to draw national publicity. Demonstrations, downtown, were met by

Connor and his police, who brought dogs and attacked the demonstrators fiercely in front of cameras. Thus, Conner created an incident, which supplied press coverage for the protest "(Colaiaco, 1993: 60).

The main question here - if whites did these protests, will they receive the same treatment from police forces? "The dog plunged forward biting several African Americans; firemen turned the hoses with pressured water against them. That evening television broadcast brought the horrors of racism in Birmingham into living rooms of millions of Americans" (Colaiaco,1993: 74). By camera, violence practices and the system were exposed and it was seen through television screens by American people and the world. "Across America, people watched television pictures of children being blasted with water hoses and attacked by police dogs. Newspaper and magazine, at home and abroad, featured the events in Birmingham on their front pages. (Wexler, 1993: 165). Here we can say that the observer of nonviolent practices can document the brutality of violent adherents.

Second, it appears when "facing arrest". If African Americans show any kind of opposition or refusal to obey cruel orders, they will face arrest. Rosa Parks is an example to this case; she was arrested because she refused to stand up and give her seat to a white man." On the third stop, the first four rows of the bus were filled with white passengers. A white passenger was left standing .J .F. Blake, the bus driver, asked Parks and the others, who were sitting on the aisle to give up their seats. The other three African Americans moved. But Parks refused to give up her seat. The driver called the police and had Parks arrested" (Garrow, 1986: 11). King was also arrested, despite democracy allowed freedom of speech and peaceful protest; African Americans were prevented from these rights "when King was arrested, he was placed in solitary confinement for violating a state court injunction, which prohibited protest demonstrations" (Colaiaco, 1993: 77).

Third: In sit-ins, black students not only received brutal treatment and arrest from police forces, but they were also attacked by white students who had been raised on hating African Americans viewing them as an inferior class in the society. This shows us how structural violence was practiced against African Americans in education and in every aspect of life. According to King, the sit in was a nonviolent form of protest. When white students in Nashville attacked black students, they did not strike back.

Instead, they were polite and showed courteous behavior towards those who refused to serve them (King, 1999: 36).

When Blacks were attacked or assaulted by White citizens, they did not receive enough protection from police. It has been seen that police protection and security was only provided to Whites while African Americans were excluded from this protection." The riders (freedom riders) were severely attacked and arrested by Whites in Montgomery Birmingham and South Carolina. They were brutally beaten by white mobs without receiving any adequate local police protection" (Colaiaco, 1993: 37). Despite the brutal confrontation against African Americans, they succeeded to hold democracy values through the real practice of nonviolent strategy. Black's victory could be the victory of any other oppressed nation who has the ability to learn from them.

Conclusion

Based on the previous sections, it can be concluded that African Americans life underwent three main periods. The first period was the slavery life that was governed with violent practices. Second, democratic era which did not end violent practices against the blacks; instead, it increased the number of discriminatory laws. Third, African Americans guaranteed their place in a democratic life when they struggled nonviolently to advocate democracy. However, the previous cruel practices showed how large segments of white citizens cooperated and worked together to prevent and to violate African American rights. These groups were created from ties established between organizations and individuals who had common agreements and understandings. In fact, this agreement between whites to treat African Americans as inferior class, created institutional violence which was clearly manifested by government institutions such as police, courts, schools and universities.

The tragedy of black's life has allowed us to discover and see different forms of violence that the democratic government practiced against them. As a result, institutional and structural violence were hard and difficult to face. In African American case, the peaceful or nonviolent demonstrations helped to reveal these forms. However, African American history points out two important relationships: The first one is between the violent Civil War and the citizens need for a democratic

life. Second, it is between African Americans nonviolent resistance and democracy that is clear through African Americans struggle towards civil rights and voting act . This close relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy must be clearly understood by any nation who wishes to adopt them, otherwise, democracy will be in the" non-right "direction.

Ultimately, the nation who seeks democracy is the one that avoids violent revolutions and seeks to learn from other nation's nonviolent experience. This nation shall have the ability to select a proper leader who believes in solving internal and external conflicts nonviolently and keeps his nation away from any catastrophic fate. "Those who advocate violence today, whether military men who accept war as a natural human activity, or revolutionists who believe a violent transfer of power to be the only method of social change, are placing their faith in violence at a time when the ultimate violence means mass suicide" (Bingham, 1970: 124).

Chapter VI

Conclusion

'The minute you hear "freedom" or "democracy", watch out because in a truly free nation, no one has to tell you're free' (Jacques Fresco, 2010). Today, democracy occupies an important place in people's minds and current polices. Why not, for democracy holds many positive values such as freedom, justice, equality, and these values represent its core. It is the right of people to dream and seek democratic life which allows for better life conditions. In this context, people should understand what democracy is. However, in the Arab Spring revolution people always speak about their need for a democratic life. The question is, what do these people really know about democracy and its relative relationships with other concepts such as violence and nonviolence? On the other side, many of them consider the concept of violence as a contradiction to democracy. However, the reality is different; democracy in its practice shows us how it is associated with many forms of violence.

Dealing with the need for democracy in the Middle East and ignorance of its relationships could guide people to a real catastrophe. Certainly, the catastrophe has happened in our present days when part of the Arab Spring revolutionaries lost the boundaries between democracy, freedom and violence. Some of them think that democracy grants them the right to do whatever they want. Unfortunately, the misunderstanding between democracy, freedom and violent protests is more dangerous than violence itself. The misunderstanding of these relationships would create a type of people who would exploit disorder to their own interests and the result may be a new dictatorial regime. Absence of a ruling body and chaos can destroy any country especially if citizens think that they have the right to commit killing, lynching and damage property for achieving democracy. In these issues, historical facts show us several nations who succeeded in creating or establishing democracy after several violent or nonviolent revolutions. Particularly, the study of other nations experience does not mean that we have to follow their footsteps since every liberation movement has its own unique circumstances.

In this point, the American society had undergone the experience of the three concepts violence, nonviolence and democracy. We can learn a lot from African Americans

experience. During their slavery life until the triumph of civil rights movements by Martin Luther King's leadership, African Americans resembled then the most important representations of these relationships. According to Odeh, in the cold war era, the United States proclaimed itself as the leader of the free world and democracy, while African Americans were suffering from segregation, deprived of freedom and considered as inferior class (Odeh, 2006). Thereby, this research tried to present the three concepts as separate entities first. At the same time, it presented them through their integral relationships with each other. It began by identifying violence that is considered a very important concept in human life. Moreover, violence is not a new phenomenon since it already exists in our daily life. Certainly, we could not discuss government practices or people resistance without mentioning the domination of violence on different levels.

In reality, we found out that violence from past times until today's present, affected the stability and security of many countries; thus, we have to understand it so as to control its destructive consequences, since we are capable of doing so. Our misunderstanding of the causes of violence and its characteristics in politics will reflect badly on individuals, groups, institutions, and levels of the system. To reemphasize what has been said, we stress that violence in politics has different faces; it can be structural, institutional, political or others. These faces are integrated together in the political life to shape deep chains of governments around human life. Thus, in order to strengthen democracy away from violence that is eroding democratic institutions and losing minorities rights, there is real need to identify, resist and struggle against violence in all of its forms in order to strengthen democracy.

However, the coexistence of both features of democracy and violence is a salient fact. This due to:

1. The ability of violence to posse the force which can really make a change the society.

2. A democratic government always tries to protect itself and make its choices not far from practicing violence to protect its authority and existence against any threat. In fact, dealing with violence encourages us to wonder whether violence practices are always immoral or can we justify these practices of violence.

It is hard to say that there are moral justifications to violence. Sometimes historical facts and people situations show that resort to violent revolutions makes it difficult to speak about the rightness or the wrongness of it. This matter depends on many factors such as the power of causes that push towards violence, the political situation, the level of freedom of speech, the freedom of protests and opposition that were allowed to people in that time. All of these factors are important when we speak about the morality of violence in particular. It is important to indicate that violence sometimes is out of control, or not really a matter of choice. Oppression and violence are sometimes the causes that force people to revolt. In this context, people often justify the morality of violence in their destructive revolution because of the oppression and unfair politics that they had faced. According to Ted" violence is not really a matter of choice or decision of individuals. It is more a part of history's inevitable course. This doctrine of historical inevitability is attributed to Marx, of course, and the phrases used in its expression are well known. It has had, and will continue to have, some moral and political importance (Ted, 1976:1). At last, violence facts cause us to curious and inquisitive. It drives us to ask, does violence give or grant us life? does it create a community or destroy it? These questions are easy to think of, but they are a very difficult to answer. "By imagining dead bodies transformed into collective spirit, both "John Brown's Body" and the Gettysburg Address make the counterintuitive, if familiar, claim that violence gives life, creating community rather than destroying it. During the American Civil War, an organic model of civic unity, governed by the principles of transformation and growth, helped to convince the public that self-sacrifice was a source of collective renewal" (Body, 2004: 38). At all, in the eyes of many, violence breeds violence and it is always considered as a destructive power whatever its achievements are.

So what is the alternative to violence? How we can avoid it and what is the cost? Negotiations, nonviolence and peaceful activities can take its place. However, all of these efforts need high capabilities to become true. It also needs training, time, patience, determination and capability to learn. Nonviolence can be one which pushes towards peaceful solutions. However, at the same time, it needs many other factors to be effective. When we resort to nonviolence, we need to be convinced of it from our inner feeling. People who do not have the seeds of nonviolence right from their roots cannot be nonviolent members in a moment. The morality of nonviolence is the power

that withdraws its follower's affiliation. Affiliation to nonviolence is to understand its meaning and objectives. Thus, it leads us to a good start and end. Clearly, nonviolence effectiveness and morality can appear through:

1. End of cooperation between violence and nonviolence adherents.

2. Disobedience of the oppressor.

3. Familiarity with many methods such as: methods of nonviolent actions, nature and control of political power, methods of social, economic, and political boycott, dynamics of nonviolent actions and so on. However, the implications of these methods can provide people with the basic rules of moral practices that are the most important factors that guide to the success of nonviolent struggle. "To have the best chance of success, the nonviolent actionists must stick with their chosen technique. An extensive, determined and skilful application of nonviolent action will cause the opponent very special problems, which will disturb or frustrate the effective utilization of his own forces "(Sharp, 1973:110).

However, the victory and achievement of a nonviolent struggle are not easy to access. Nonviolent actionists must be willing to risk punishment as a part of the price of victory. The differences between violence and nonviolence cannot be counted. But when men revolt nonviolently, or violently, also when government monopolies violence or acts violently with its nation, the choice between violence or nonviolence depends on the surrounding political atmosphere that in a way or another can lead to the success of violent or nonviolent resistance. Furthermore, democracy is the political concept that allows for the emergence of violence and nonviolence. In a democratic life, people or governments are in close relationship with violence and nonviolence.

American history and its society represent a suitable example of these relationships. The story of these relationships begins with slavery life and the War of Independence to the Civil War. From slavery to the civil rights act, it is a long period where we can see violence. Then, there was the great depression of African Americans towards democratic life, but they did not give up or resort to a violent revolution; they advocated democracy nonviolently through their movements and leaders. Then the success of civil rights movement in their nonviolent struggle 1964-1965 pointed to the

deep relationship between democracy and nonviolence. Thus, the entire story of African Americans leads us to say that the U.S society granted us the opportunity to know how a democratic system can practice different forms of violence. At the same time, African Americans nonviolent struggle expanded our understanding of the nonviolent democracy relationship.

By depending on the democracy relationship, people also need to understand the boundaries between democracy and freedom that they have abide by and not cross over; otherwise, a society will go through mob, chaos and loss of victims. In fact, anyone who seeks freedom and democracy has to pay the price of patience, responsibility, commitment and organization. The following quotation states: "Freedom is not free" (Sharp, 1993: 67); it means that freedom does not mean that you are free in what you do and think especially if this freedom is misused or abused. **As a result people who seek after a democratic life have to realize that:**

First, violence in the American Civil War was one of the main tools in the foundation of democracy. In addition, violence was not only practiced against African Americans during slavery phases, but it was also practiced throughout democratic era.

Second, nonviolence is an important tool to advance and strengthen democracy. Regarding this point, the study shows how African American civil rights movements, under the leadership of Martin Luther King, had been successful in advancing American democracy throughout the adoption of nonviolent strategies.

Third, there is a relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy; the more democratic the society, the more it is able to solve domestic conflicts nonviolently.

Fourth, both violent and nonviolent forms of resistance have the ability to make changes in the society, but nonviolence has the ability to bring the desirable change at a lesser cost in human souls and property. For instance, in India, Gene Sharp indicates, "in nonviolence struggle for independence…probably not more than eight thousand died directly or indirectly as a result of shooting and other injures…Meanwhile, in the 7-year French-Algerian War, 1955-1962, the number of Algerian dead [was estimated] by some as high as nearly a million out of a population only ten times that size" (Graves, 2005: 7).

Fifth: Lack of planning will lead to catastrophic results when destructive violence dominates a random and rapid change from a dictatorial regime to a democratic one. As Sharp (1993: 35) mentioned, "At times the lack of planning by democrats has left crucial decisions to chance, with disastrous results. Even when the oppressive system was brought down, lack of planning on how to handle the transition to a democratic system has contributed to the emergence of a new dictatorship".

In light of the previous chapters, the study recommends the following:

1) It is very important to search for implicit relationships between the three concepts Violence, nonviolence and democracy through reading, listening and teaching programs. It is achieved through studying successful struggles of other nations; this would expand and deepen the knowledge accumulated about these three concepts.

2) It is important to plan, determine and create unity between individuals and institutions to strengthen inferior groups. Unity between all levels of society would be the main tool to win a "democratic life" nonviolently. As Charles Stewart Parnell pointed out, " it is no use relying on the government… You must only rely upon your own determination…[H]elp yourself by standing together …strengthen those amongst yourself who are weak...,band yourself together, organize yourself…and you must win" (Sharp, 1993: 7).

3) It is crucial to teach children from early grades that nonviolent actions are more preferable than violence in making the desirable changes in the society. This will help in bringing up a new generation that is taught to think nonviolently. In addition, internet and media are now available everywhere for children to learn and familiarize themselves with such huge bulk of information. People who seek liberty have to teach their future generation how to free themselves from early ages.

4) It is strongly recommended that more in-depth researcher be conducted in order to include other success stories from other parts of the world; this will help other researchers to apply the lessons learnt from different nations with diverse cultures in order to have a better understanding of this integrated relationship between violence, nonviolence and democracy. It should be investigated and implemented to enrich, and fill the gap that was unintentionally missed in this research.

Bibliography:

A: Books

Ansbro, John J. & Martin Luther king, Jr.: (2000).

Nonviolent Strategies and Tactics for Social Change.Lanham, Maryland :Madison Books..

Abukishek …[et al] .(2010). Reading in American Democratic Culture. Palestine, Jerusalem: AL-Quds University Publishing Press.

Arendt ,Hannah. (1970). *On Violence*, 1969-1970. Translated by Ibraheem Alarees, 26 Westbourne Grove. London: w25rh United Kingdom

Bailey, Ronald. (1977). *Violence and Aggression. United State : Time Life International*, (Nederland) B.V.

Brinkley, Alan. (2007). American History, New York: Published by McGraw-Hill.

Bingham, Jonathan. (1970). *Violence & Democracy*, New York: Published by the World Publishing Company.

Bourke.R. (2003). Peace in Ireland: the War of Ideas, London: Pamlico.

Colaiaco, James, A Martin Luther King,.Jr.(1993) A *Postal of Militant Nonviolence*, New York:: St. Martin's Press.

Curtin, Dean & Robert, Litke. (1994).Institution Violence. Netherlands. Amsterdam Atlanta: Editions Rodopi B.V.

Davis, James. (1971). *When Men Revolt and Why*, A Division of Macmillan, New York :Publishing Co., Inc.

Derrida, Jacques.(2002). Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority. In Gil Anidjar, ed. Acts of Religion, New York: Routledge.

Fink, Sami.(2002). The Declaration of Independence. USA: (N.P).

Gerstle, Gary. (2001). American Crucible: Race and nation in the twentieth century. Princeton, New Jersy: Princeton University press.

Garrow, David J. (1986). Bearing the cross :Martin Luther KING, Jr. and The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, New York: William Morrow and company ,Inc.

Hamby, Alonoz L.(1985). Liberalism and its Challenges: F.D.R.to Reagon, New York:Oxford University Press, Inc.

Harrison, Brigid …[et al]. (2009). American Democracy Now. New York: McGraw, Hill, a Business Unit of the McGraw. Hill Companies.Inc.

Janda, Kennetch…[et al].(1992). The Challenge of Democracy. USA: Library of Congress.

Stewart, Pamela& Andrew, Strathern.(2002). Violence: Theory and Ethnography. New York: Continuum, 1 Edtion(January 31,2003).

Keane, John. (1996). Reflection On Violence. London: Verso.

Keane, John. (2004). Violence and Democracy. USA: Cambridge University Press.

King , Martin Luther Jr.(1964). Why We Can't Wait. New York: penguin Books USA, Inc..

King,, Martin Luther Jr., (2007). *Martin Luther king,Jr* .USA: Dream Blue Mountain Press. Inc.

King, Mary. (1999). Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr.: The power of Nonviolent action, Paris: Editions du Moulfon.

Lowi, Theodore J. (2008). American Government. United State of America: Herter Notion.

Marshall, Monty G. (1999). "political Violence and War".*Third World War: System, Process and Conflict Dynamics*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield publishers,20-57.

Martin, Glen T. (2008). Revolutionary Democracy. USA: Publisher's cCtalogue- in - publishing data. 9936 West Camden Av, Sun City.

Moran, Mary.H. (2006).The Violence of Democracy, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Morris, Aldon. (1984).The *Origin of The Civil Rights Movements, Black Communities Organizing for Change*, New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc.

Honderich, Ted. (1976) .Political *violence*, New York: published by Cornell university press.

Phillips, Donald Thomas. Martin Luther King, Jr. (1998). *On Leader Ship: Inspiration &Wisdom for Challenging Times*. New York: Warner books, Inc.

Ross, D. (2004). Violent Democracy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharp, Gene. (1996). *Politics of Nonviolence Action: Power and Struggle*. Translated by Waleed Silaiby, Beirut: Published: Dar Al-Jaded Co.

Sharp, Gene. (1993). From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation. Bangkok: By The Committee for Restoration of Democracy in Burma(The New Era Journal).

Sharp, Gene. (1973). *The political of: The Methods Of Nonviolence Action*. Boston: Porter sergent: Publishers.

Spitzer, Robert.J… [et al]. (2002). *Essentials of American Politic,* New York: W.W.Norton&Company, Inc.

Washington, James Melvin, ED.A. (1986). *Testament of Hope: the Essential Writing of Martin Luther King, Jr*. Francisco: Harper Row, Publisher, Inc.

Wexler, Sanford. (1993). *The Civil Rights Movements*: An Eyewitness History. New York: facts on File, Inc.

William, Joel. (1984). " The Crucible of Race: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation. New York: Oxford university press.

B: Articles

Conference paper:

Allen, fidelis. (2009). "Introduction to Nonviolence Struggle: Theory, History and Successes". Paper Delivered For Seminar on Nonviolent Struggle, 7-8 August, Port Harvard, Nigeria. Available online at: http://www.rosalux.sn/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Introduction-to-Non-Violent-Strugggle.pdf

Berolzheimer ,Alan.(2012)." Continuing and Change in American Democracy, 1861 to the Present" The Flow of History Project Historian. © 2012 Flow of History C/o Southeast Vermont Community Learning. Flow @ learning Collaborative.Org. flow@learningcollaborative.org. available online at: http://www.flowofhistory.org/themes/american_republic/back_essay.php

Bedav, Hugo . (2012) "The Case Against the Death Penalty". American Civil Liberties Union. Home, Capital Punishment. *published by the ACLU as a pamphlet in 1973.* Vol (40). No.(1): 21-179. Available online at: https://www.aclu.org/capital-punishment/case-against-death-penalty

Beck,E,M & Tolnay,Stewan.E.(2003)."The Killing Fields of the Deep South: the Market for Cotton and the Lynching of Blacks",1882-1930.American Sociological Review,Vol.55,No.4(Aug.,1990):526-539.
Available online at: http://utminers.utep.edu/trcurry/Lynching%20article.pdf

Blau, P.M.& Golden, R.M.(1986).Metropolitan Structure and Criminal violence. Sociological Quarterly, 27(1), 15-26. Available online at: http://homes.hendrix.edu/leighton/writing/downloads_files/SVintro.pdf

Brzechczyn, Krzysztof. (2004). "The Concept of Nonviolence in the Political Theology of Martin Luther King". Adam Mickiewiz University Press. No (90): 129-137. Available online at:http://www.academia.edu/2190545/The_Concept_of_Nonviolence_in_the_Political_Theology_of_Martin_Luther_King

Caldeira, T. and Holsten, J. (1999)." Democracy and Violence in Brazil". Comparative studies in society and History(1999), Vol .41.No.04. pp.: 691-729. Available online at: http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=58009Calhoun,

L. (2002). " How Violence Breed Violence: Some Utilitarian Consideration". Politics Vol. 22,NO. 2, pp: 95-108. Available online at: http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/41802340?uid=2&uid=4&sid=21102937094467

Debbie, Wei. (2004)." The Black Panther Party Legacy and Lessons for the Future". Handout1: History of the Black Panther Party-Part One:1-26. www.Civil Rights Teaching.org. Available online at: http://www.civilrightsteaching.org/Handouts/BPPhandout.pdf

Gregg, Richard B.(1960). "The Power of Nonviolence". Greenleaf Books Canton, Main 1197 Main Street, Hart Ford:1-192.Available online at: http://www.nonviolenceunited.org/pdf/thepowerofnonviolence0206.pdf

Helvey, Robert. (2004)." On Strategic Nonviolent Conflict: Thinking About the Fundamentals ". The Albert Institution Helvey Robert. United state institution of peace (USIP)Grant::1-77.Available online at: http://www.aeinstein.org/organizations/org/OSNC.pdf

Irwin, Bob & Faison Gordon (1984). " Why Nonviolence? Introduction to Nonviolence Theory and Strategy". New Society Publisher. Prepared for Posting on the Web by Randy Shutt, September 2002: 2-10.Available online at: http://www.vernalproject.org/papers/understanding/WhyNonviolence.pdf

Jacome, Felipe. (2005)." Trans Mexican Migration; a Case of Structural Violence". London School of Economic: 1-36. Available online at: http://lanic.utexas.edu/project/etext/llilas/ilassa/2009/jacome.pdf

Jenny, Pearce…[et al]. (2011)." Violence, Security and Democracy: Perverse Interfaces and Their Implications for State and Citizens in the Global South "Institute of Development Studies, Vol(2011) No.357: 1-36. Available online at: http://www.drc-citizenship.org/system/assets/1052734710/original/1052734710-pearce_etal.2011-perverse.pdf

Joseph, Penile E. (2009)." The Black Power Movement, Democracy, and America in the King Years". American Historical Review: Octobor 2009:1001-1016.Available online at:http://www.penielejoseph.com/BlackPowerMovementDemocracy.pdf

Kamel, Rachel& Kerness, Bonnie. (2003)." The prison Inside the Prison": Control Units, Supermax Prisons, and Devices of Torture. Philadelphia. Available in downloadable (PDF) format at http://ww,afs.org/justicevisions.htm:1-12 Available online at: http://afsc.org/sites/afsc.civicactions.net/files/documents/PrisonInsideThePrison.pdf

King, Martin Jr.(1967) Speech Delivered at a Meeting of Clergy and Laity Concerned at the River side Church in New York on the 4 of April. Available online at:http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/45a/058.html

Kleinman, Arthur. (2000)." The Violence of Everyday Life: the Multiple Forms and Dynamics of Social Violence" In Violence and Subjectivity. Ed. Vienna Das, Artthur Kleinman, Mamphela, Ramphele, and Pamela Reynolds. Berkley: university of California Press.pp:226-241. Available online at : http://www.academia.edu/3615773/Structural_Violence

Krebs, Andreas. (2007)." The Transcendent and the Postcolonial Violence in Derrida and Fanon". Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge. A Head Publishing House. University of Ottawa, Canada. Vol .5. pp: 89-100.Available online at: http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/27172066/transcendent-postcolonial-violence-derrida-fanon

Little, Adrian (2005). " Theories of Democracy and violence: the case of northern Ireland". Theories, 53(111): 62-86. Available online at: http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/41802340?uid=2&uid=4&sid=21102937094467

Mc. Adam.D. (1982). "Political Process and the Development of Black insurgency 1930-1970". Chicago: Univ, Chicago presses.Available online at: http://goodliffe.byu.edu/310/protect/mcadam.pdf

Marcuse, Herbert. (1967). "The End of Utopia" and "The Problem of Violence and the Radical Opposition," Published in *Psychoanalyse und Politic*, were Lectures delivered at the Free University of West Berlin in July 1967: 83-94. Available online at: http://www.marcuse.org/herbert/pubs/60spubs/67endutopia/67EndUtopiaProbViol.htm

Morris, Aldon D.A.(1999)" Retrospective on The Civil Rights Movements; Political and Intellectual landmarks". Annual Review of Sociology, Vol.25. pp:517-539. Available online at http://www.charltonmcilwain.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Morris-Aldon.pdf:

Odeh, Abdel Alhakim.(2006)." Changing Values & Attitudes Through Nonviolence: "Case study martin Luther king. M.A. Degree. Al-Quds University:1-290.

Onion Rebecca (2013)." Take the impossible" literacy"test Louisiana Gave black votes in 1960s. Posted on Friday, June 28, 2013.Available online at: http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_vault/2013/06/28/voting_rights_and_the_supreme_court_the_impossible_literacy_test_louisiana.html

Paul Farmer." Anthropology of Structural Violence. united State"s. Published by: The University of Chicago Press. *Vol. 45, No. 3 (June 2004),* pp. *305-325.available online at:* http://socanth.tu.ac.th/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/farmer1.pdf

Rice, France.(2009)."The Democratic Party Owes Blacks an Apology ". National Black www.NBRA.Info Republican Association. Newsletter .Democratic Apology Edition. Available online at: http://images.nbra.info/docs/library/NationalBlackRepublicanAssociation2009/The%20Democratic%20Party%20Owes%20Blacks%20An%20Apology.pdf

Rummel, R..J. (1998)." Democracy and War: Replay", The Independent Review: A journal of Political Economy Vol (111), No (1): 103-107.Available online at: http://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir_03_1_rummel.pdf

See Shut, Randy. 2005,"Effective Nonviolent Action" The Peacemaker, June , http://wwww.vernal project.org. Accessed on The 17th July, 2009.

Graves, Spencer.(2005). "The impact of violence and nonviolence action on constructed realties and conflicts". Violence & nonviolence realties: 1-38. Accessed in 1 may 2005.Available online at:
http://www.prodsyse.com/conflict/Nonviolence&Reality.pdf

Stephen, Zunes. (2009)."The Power of Nonviolence Actions". Ejournal USA, Vol(14), No(3), March, p:4.

Sterling & Kittross.J.(1978).Stay Tuned: Aconsise History of American broadcasting. Belmont.Wadsworth. available online at:
http://www.charltonmcilwain.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Morris-Aldon.pdf

Unnithan, N.P. & Whitt, H.P. (1982). Inequality Economic Development and Lethal Violence: A Cross-National Analysis of Suicide and Homicide. International Journal of Comparative Sociology.33 (3-4), 182-196. Available online at:
http://homes.hendrix.edu/leighton/writing/downloads_files/SVintro.pdf

Violence Prevention Alliance. (2010)." Definition and Typology of Violence". In global campaign for violence prevention: http://www.who Int/violence prevention /approach / definition/en/ index. Htm1 (Retrieved 29/3/2010)

Weatherspoon, Floyd D. (2006)." Article: Racial Justice and Equity for African American Educational System: A Dream Forever Deferred". North Carolina Central university School of Law: 1-41.Available online at:
http://racism.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1473:educational-system&catid=49&Itemid=172

World Health Organization. (2002)." *World report on violence and health*." Geneva:World health organization. Available online at: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2002/9241545615.pdf

Winter, D.D., & Leighton, D.C.(2001). "Structural Violence". In D.J.Cristie R.V. Wagner, &D.D.Winter (Eds), Peace Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology in the 21 st Century. Englewood Cliffs,New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Available online at:
http://homes.hendrix.edu/leighton/writing/downloads_files/SVintro.pdf

العنف واللاعنف في الديمقراطيه الأمريكية: النضال الافريقي الامريكي لنيل الحقوق المدنيه

اعداد الطالبه:عاليه محمد علي سويلم

مشرفة الدراسة: راشيل بيسبرج

الملخص

غالباً ما يميل المجتمع إلى افتراض أن المجتمعات الديمقراطية هي غير عنيفة بالفطرة، إلا أن هذا الافتراض ليس صحيحاً بالضرورة وربما ينطوي في حقيقة الأمر على مشكلات سياسية.وبناء على ذلك تهدف الدراسة إلى توضيح العلاقات القائمة بين الديمقراطية والعنف واللاعنف. وتستخدم الدراسة صراع الأفارقة الأمريكيين لنيل الحقوق المدنية بوصفها دراسة حالة، إذ تكشف لنا أشكال التشابك بين المقاومة العنيفة و اللاعنف في المجتمعات الديمقراطية. إن الصراع السلمي للأفارقة الأمريكيين يبين لنا كيف أن الولايات المتحدة كونها دولة ديمقراطية قد تخلت عن منهج المقاومة السلمية و لجأت إلى العنف في الكثير من الأحيان.

تقوم هذه الدراسه على افترضين مهمين: اولا, هنالك علاقه ما بين العنف واللاعنف والديمقراطيه. ثانيا, كلما زادت الديمقراطيه في المجتمع زادت قدرته على استخدام وسائل اللاعنف والتخلي عن وسائل العنف في حل النزاعات المحليه . ولكي يتم اثبات هذين الافتراضين تم توصل الباحثه الى النتائج التاليه: اولا,كان العنف في الحرب الاهليه الامريكيه احد اهم ادوات تأسيس الديمقراطيه. ثانيا, لم يمارس العنف ضد الافارقه الامركيين خلال فترة العبوديه فحسب, وانما مورس ايضا خلال العهد الديمقراطي. ثالثا, اللاعنف اداة مهمه في تقدم الديمقراطيه وتقويتها. وفي ما يتعلق في هذه الخاصيه, تبين الدراسه كيف نجحت حركات الحقوق المدنيه للافارقه الامركيين بقيادة مارتن لوثر كينج في تقدم الديمقراطيه الامريكيه من خلال تبني استراتيجيات المقاومه السلميه.

يتبع هذا البحث المنهج الاستطلاعي والتاريخي والتحليلي, ويتبنى المعلومات التاريخيه حول صراع الافارقه الامركيين لنيل حقوقهم المدنيه في اكتشاف العلاقه ما بين الديمقراطيه والعنف واللاعنف.

في الوقت الذي تتناول العديد من الأبحاث العربية العنف واللاعنف والديمقراطية على أنها مسائل منفصلة تأتي هذه الدراسة مختلفة من جهة معالجتها للعلاقات القائمة بين هذه المفاهيم المهمة مجتمعة. لذا سيتم فيما بعد ترجمة هذه الرسالة إلى اللغة العربية لإفساح المجال أمام القراء العرب للتعرف الى أهمية فهم علاقة الديمقراطية بمفهومي العنف واللاعنف.

توصي الدراسة وبشده على ضرورة إجراء المزيد من البحث المعمق لتكوين فهم أفضل لهذه العلاقة التكاملية ما بين العنف و اللاعنف و الديمقراطية. وباللاضافه الى ذلك ,كلما زاد عدد البحوث التي تستقصي وتتحقق حول هذا البحث كلما زاد الإثراء و تعبئة الفجوه التي يمكن أن يكون هذا البحث قد غفل عنها دون قصد.