

# Nonviolent vs violent revolutions

[History](#), [Revolution](#)



Violence and bloodshed are terrible things to sacrifice in the course of a Revolution, but are the only effective ways one could possibly occur. It is impossible for any other method to be more effective in achieving a revolution other than violence and bloodshed. Mankind has use this method for tens of thousands of years, and is the only form of governmental rebellion used. Some other forms of government has been tried, but none other were more successful than the original method of brute force. Nonviolent revolutions are extremely ineffective in the sense of trying to rebel against the government.

The people of a nation would have no way to take control in the government. Without the use of violence, the people have no power. The government is too powerful to overthrown, and a ruler would certainly not be intimidated with mere protests, and petty strikes. The only way to actually strike fear in the government is to use violence. There are many political benefits of using violence and bloodshed to have an effective revolution. The government is not afraid to use violence, even if you are. If the people of a nation do not use violence, the government can still resort the their military in order to take down the people.

The government is only trying to do what is right for them in order to stay in power. Also, when not using violence and harmful threats against the government, they will not be under any pressure to make decisions quickly. Since no actual force is being used on them, the government does not need to rush decisions, as there are no consequences of waiting. In a revolution with violence and bloodshed, the government will be rushed into making a decision in order to prevent any more harm to people. Most of the time, the <https://assignbuster.com/nonviolent-vs-violent-revolutions/>

government will try to save as many lives as possible, and surrender to the people quickly.

On an economical view, revolutions with violence and bloodshed will not be destructive the economy. The many deaths of fighting will not change the lifestyles' of the people too much, as only the men would be going to war. In an nonviolent revolution, everyone- including women and children, would be participating, since they would not be physically harmed. If during a violent revolution where men would go to war, women would still be able to financially support their children, and the men would make sure that their families would not get involved. A nonviolent revolution is a waiting game.

Since there is no actual harm being done to the people or the government, both parties will not feel obligated to back out. All of the time being wasted on protesting, and nonviolently fighting would be expensive. The people would be giving up time they could use to work or do something productive to just protest, or boycott. Time is money, and although money can be made up, time can never be recovered if lost. From a social standpoint, there will not be a drastic change in society that will negatively affect the nation.

Mankind's instincts are to survive in any means necessary, which will almost always involve war, and blood being shed.

Although wars are horrible things that happen, we people have adjusted to not feel as bad when he hurt people, as long as we benefit. Our society will become slightly more corrupt, but much more manageable than if our revolution was nonviolent. Nonviolent revolutions are very hard on society. As humans, we tend to be greedy people, and only care about themselves.

People tend to only care for themselves, and cannot help one another unless in a state of emergency. There is no emergency in a nonviolent revolution, because no people die.

People do not put a lot of effort into nonviolent revolutions, as their instinct would make it feel like it is not important to them. The government has a military, which can take down any citizens that try to rebel nonviolently. The only way to stop this would be to take down the government first. The government is not under any pressure when in a nonviolent revolution, and are not sacrificing anything by wasting time in a revolution. The economy during a violent revolution will not suffer, because only the men are going to fight. Time is being wasted though, when in a nonviolent revolution, and cannot be recovered.

Humans do not suffer that drastic of a loss when we go to war, as it is our natural instincts. It is not natural for us however, to show acts of kindness unless in a state of emergency. To conclude, effective revolutions can only occur through violence and bloodshed. Nonviolent revolutions are not as effective as non-violent revolutions. Force is the only way to accomplish anything. To a government, and a body of people, fear is the greatest motivator. Without fear, there would be no way to take control of a government, or rebel. Kindness and protests will not stop a government as they are too powerful.