

* Moral force protest has a greater chance to succeed than physical force protest. Discuss in relation to our contemporary world.

In the modern world today, there is an immense diversity of global issues which are constantly being dealt with. Moral force protest as well as physical force protest are used, in hope of achieving a purpose and proving a point. For both of these acts of protest, there must be a substantial amount of facts and evidences backing it up. Both protests, no matter how it's done, are in some way seeking for the support of the 'leaders', most of the time, the 'leaders' being the government.

Moral force protest involves logical convincing speeches which are fighting for a cause within the boundaries of law. It's possible to legally get enough support for a cause and eventually win by never once using any sort of violence. In some cases, hunger strikes by the 'victims' are also done. Aside from well constructed speeches and hunger strikes, the refusal to obey certain laws and the passive resistance, that is, resisting to incoming violence usually from the government, are other ways to morally protest without any physical violence. Sometimes due to the refusal to abide to certain laws the supporters may find abusive, the moral force protest supporters might find themselves confronting the law, and perhaps even acting illegally. In recent years, certain countries which hadn't previously given women the right to vote changed their decision by receiving strong moral force protest; this right was gained, and nowadays in those countries women possess the right to vote. Physical force wasn't in any way used in this case.

The opposing way to support some strong cause can be through physical force protests. This involves violent protests which may harm people purposely. Destructive attitude from the people supporting a cause by using physical force is indeed very common. In most cases violence is used in hope of getting attention and media publicity. Physical force protest, has a very distinctive difference from moral force protest; one of the most important ones being that, by violence, these supporters are terrorising the general public, and trying to get the government to recognise their terrorism, and give in. Moral force protest is not even remotely linked with terrorism.

Not in any way, do the supporters practising moral force protest adapt to terrorism like do these physical force supporters. By terrorising the general public and the government itself, these supporters think they'll create such an intolerable situation that the government will give in to their extreme and sometimes unnecessary violence. Now, if any government is prepared to give in their monopoly of violence over to a group supporting an intelligent and important cause through physical force protest, the situation is most likely to deteriorate rapidly. The government's monopoly of violence should constantly remain intact, under no circumstance should it be put at risk, no matter how threatening a situation they are facing. Violence should remain their monopoly.

A few examples of physical force protest can be seen in recent IRA bombings; the purpose of the IRA being to gain independence for Northern Ireland from Britain. So far, these bombings have proved to be counter productive, nevertheless, the IRA seem to be relentless. Therefore they continue to terrorise society and sometimes wound or even kill innocent people.

Although not impossible to answer, the issue of whether which protest is more successful, moral or physical, it is a very complex and contradiction filled subject to discuss and come to a logical and correct conclusion to. The acceptance of either form of protest can be in many ways extremely contradictory. Due to the sea of information that surrounds this issue, many valid arguments can be cleverly twisted in order to support or go against either side. While some people may see their own argument as being absolutely valid and completely true in favour of moral protest force, someone else can easily turn around that same argument and use it against moral force protest, and in favour of physical force protest, still seeing the argument and reasons as a definite truth. After all, truth is the real state of things, according to each individual.

A reasonable speech clearly justifying any reasons backing up a specific cause may be a lot more effective than acting upon blatant violence to gain the needed attention to support a global cause. If the fight for a cause consists of thoughtful and intelligent reasons, it is likely that the case stated will be heard attentively; more so than if any kind of physical force was used. Valid facts and accurate statistics and information that act within the law have a high chance of achieving their goal due to the fact that there are no illegalities being used, no crime is committed, no panic should be feared.

Martin Luther King Jr. fought with all his might and power in favour of the blacks of the United States; never once using force, his speeches and protests were tremendously well received, and always heard. He is in fact, most remembered for his "I have a dream" speech, which caused many Americans to stop and think about the cause being fought. By purely using moral force protest, Luther King ended racism in the US of A, although there are still some cases of extreme racism there, Luther King's fight clearly decreased it greatly. Nevertheless, his fight was hard and long, and in more ways than none, incredibly successful, therefore very much worth it.

Hunger strikes such as the ones used by the people under the leadership of Gandhi in India, could prove to be extremely effective if done right. Gandhi was fighting for the independence of India, he wanted freedom from the English, and was prepared to do everything he could within the limits of moral force protest. By refusing to stand for violence, some people under his leadership were prepared to lay down on the ground and block the way for tanks to pass. In some ways, this could be considered illegal, and the government has the right to even arrest them, but then again, they are technically not doing anything wrong by obstructing the path for these tanks to come; or more innocently put, by simply lying on the street.

The refusal to obey the law can be considered illegal, but to a certain extent, some laws for being blatantly abusive to the general public, can and probably will be ignored by some people, understandably so.

Physics force protest has been recently used in Israel and in the UK. The Arabs with their 'suicide bombers' are killing needlessly and coldly to show their discontent with the peace process started by the Israelis. Violence to show one's discontent in the way a country is going about trying to bring peace, is undoubtedly ironic and almost unexplainable. By destroying the human race and trying to terrorise the Israelis, the Arabs aren't gaining anything at all, they're simply gaining publicity which shouldn't be given to them in the first place, for their acts are simply monstrous.

The IRA is also a very good example of supporters fighting for a strong and just cause by means of violence. The cause the IRA are constantly fighting for is actually one that could indeed be expressed in moral force protest and perhaps maybe even justified. By turning to violence, the IRA as well as the Arabs are immediately ruling out any possibilities of winning their causes. They are, in the long run, doomed to failure.

Today's world has enough violence and terrorism surrounding its environment to even consider using any sort of inadequate violence to fight for a cause, no matter how important. When so much progress can be acquired by simply using one's intelligence and logic and supporting a cause following moral force protest, why should anyone even stop to consider opting for useless and wasteful violence is completely beyond me. No government will ever give in to violence used in order to gain popularity and create havoc for any global issue. The quest to terrorise their way through, by any supporters using physical force protest, is in fact, counter productive, for it's never actually proven to have worked. Moral force protest can usually be very effective and successful. It should be strongly considered, specially since we are now living in a time when violence seems intent on destroying us. Keep the peace.

