

The Deliberative Classroom: Democracy, Protest and Change

STUDENT RESOURCES



Resource 1

Student Lesson Record

Democracy is more than just having elections. In order to have a democratic society we need many other things to be present. In this lesson a group of people will start off presenting features of democracy which many people think are important. Your task is to listen carefully to their arguments and to decide which seem most important. In each round of voting, you will de-select some of the speakers until you just have one left.

Your job is to think about whether you can still have a democracy with some of these features missing. You can also decide at which point you think democracy would end.

Round 1

Listen to all the opening speeches and think about which seem to be the most important features. You will have three votes to cast for your top three choices. As a class count up the total votes and de-select the bottom three (they can re-join the audience).

Write down what you think the effect would be – how would society change?

Would you still have a democracy?

Round 2

Listen to the second speeches from the remaining speakers. Cast your three votes again and de-select the bottom three (they too can re-join the audience).

Write down what you think the effect would be – how would society change?

Would you still have a democracy?

Round 3

Listen to the final three speakers. This time you have just one vote to cast. The person who wins is the last dimension left.

Write down what you think the effect would be – how would society change?

Would you still have a democracy?

Resource 2

Briefing 1– Regular elections, Nick Clegg

The principle

Regular elections to elect representatives.

One of the main ideas of democracy is that every adult has a say in who runs the government. However, it is also important to think about how regularly this should take place – too long and people don't feel the government reflects their wishes, too short and government changes too much to get things done.

The person

Nick Clegg was Deputy Prime Minister in 2010. He introduced a new law called the Fixed-term Parliaments Act.

Until this law was passed, the date of the next general election was decided by the Prime Minister. They had to call an election within five years, but could choose any date within that period. This was criticized because it gave them an unfair advantage because they could call an election when things were going well for them and badly for the other political parties.

“The Bill has a single, clear purpose: to introduce fixed-term Parliaments to the United Kingdom to remove the right of a Prime Minister to seek an election for pure political gain. This simple change will have a profound effect because for the first time in our history the timing of general elections will not be a plaything of Governments. There will be no more guessing games over the date of the next election, distracting politicians from getting on with running the country. Instead everyone will know how long a Parliament can be expected to last, bringing much greater stability to our political system.”

“Some people have asked why Parliaments will run for five years, not four. Let me explain: five years is the current maximum length. Five years is the length of Parliaments in France, Italy, and South Africa, among others, and it is the maximum length of Parliament in India. In the United Kingdom, three of the past five Parliaments have run for five years. Leaving aside the very short Parliaments, half of all Parliaments since the war have run for more than four years, so five years is both in keeping with our current arrangements, and fits with international examples.”

Speech in the House of Commons, 13 September 2010
(slightly adapted)

Further research

<http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06111>

What if this doesn't happen?

If you don't have elections then you don't really have a democracy because the government is not chosen by the people.

Eritrea has not held a general election for over 20 years.

You can read more here:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eritrea#National_elections
<https://awazetribune.com/index.php/2016/12/06/eritrea-might-conduct-presidential-elections-in-2018-sources/>

Resource 2

Briefing 2– Freedom to stand, Dr Richard Taylor MP

The principle

Freedom to stand as a candidate in elections.

It's important that everyone in a democracy can vote but also that anyone can put themselves forward in an election as a candidate. That means we can vote for anyone we want. It also means if we don't like any politicians, we can stand ourselves and do a better job.

The person

Dr. Richard Taylor MP (Independent)

Richard Taylor was a doctor who worked in Kidderminster General Hospital for 23 years until 1995. He also supported the hospital as chairman of the volunteers who helped, and from 1997-2001 he was a member of the campaign group Save Kidderminster Hospital, after plans for cuts were announced.

In 2000 the local Accident and Emergency department was closed and in 2001 Dr. Taylor stood as an independent candidate in the general election for Kidderminster Hospital and Health Concern. He won the election with a majority of over 17,000 and became the Member of Parliament (MP) for the area. He won again in 2005, but finally lost in the 2010 election. Whilst he was in parliament he became a member of the Health Select Committee, which allowed him to directly question ministers and NHS managers about the health system and cuts to hospitals. He was also a member of several groups in parliament campaigning on health issues and he made speeches in the House of Commons about the health service.

Mark Garnier won the election there in 2010 and said this about Dr. Taylor's impact:

"He has single handedly shown us all that local issues are everything, and it is very risky for political parties to ignore local issues. And he showed that no outcome is a foregone conclusion."

(Slightly adapted from original)

Further research

You can read more about Dr. Taylor's political activism here: <http://www.healthconcernwf.org.uk/>

What if this doesn't happen?

If people can't stand freely as candidates then it means those in power and in charge of political parties control who can be an MP. This narrows the range of people you can vote for and puts some people off voting at all.

In China, anyone can stand for election in theory, but in practice, the government makes it very difficult. There's a report on how an independent candidate is bullied here: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-china-37997706>

Resource 2

Briefing 3 – Free and secret ballot, Feargus O'Connor MP

The principle

Free and secret ballot.

In an election voters should be free to choose the candidate they prefer and no-one should be able to interfere in this free choice. This also means that the voter does not have to tell anyone who they voted for, so they can avoid people trying to put pressure on them.

The person

Feargus O'Connor, MP.

Feargus O'Connor was from County Cork in Ireland, when Ireland was still ruled as part of Great Britain. He became an MP (1832-35 and 1847-52) and helped to start up the working class political movement called The Chartists in 1838. This movement wrote a People's Charter which included six changes to make the system more democratic. As well as demanding the vote for working men, one of their other demands was for a 'secret ballot'. Over the next few years the Chartists put pressure on government, presenting petitions signed by millions and holding huge public meetings. These were often put down with violence from the government and some leaders were arrested.

Gradually though their ideas were introduced and the vote was extended to more people. In 1867 the Ballot Act introduced the idea of the secret ballot. This meant that tenant farmers, who owed their livelihood to the landowner, could now vote against the local landowner if they wanted, without anyone knowing. Not only did it free voters from intimidation but it also helped to end bribery, in which rich candidates would pay poorer voters to vote for them. Now no-one would know who voted for whom.

Further research

There's information about the secret ballot here: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-leeds-31630588>
And more information about O'Connor here: http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic_figures/oconnor_feargus.shtml

What if this doesn't happen?

If there is no secret ballot it means powerful people can punish poorer people for voting 'the wrong way' (i.e. against them) and it also makes it easier to bribe people and effectively pay for their votes.

Nigeria has held open ballots, which some thought were fairer, but you can read concerns about corruption here: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/gram-matenga/cash-for-votes-political-legitimacy-in-nigeria>

Resource 2

Briefing 4 – Political parties, James Keir Hardie

The principle

Political parties help organise representatives around core policy ideas.

Political parties pull together separate ideas into a programme for government. This presents voters with a simpler choice between different sets of ideas. They also help organise politicians together so they can build support for change in parliament.

The person

James Keir Hardie, Founder of the Labour Party

Keir Hardie was a working class Scotsman who helped to start the Scottish Labour Party, and then the Labour Party in 1900 to represent the interests of working people. He called for:

“A distinct Labour group in Parliament, who shall have their own organisation, and agree upon their policy, which must embrace a readiness to cooperate with any party promoting legislation in the direct interests of labour [workers]” (slightly adapted).

From starting the party with no MPs it took just 24 years until the first Labour government formed in 1924. It did not last long but was able to introduce policies to build homes at affordable rents, increased unemployment benefits and increased pensions. He believed political parties could represent the interests of different groups, and bring together their elected representatives to create change.

Further research

There’s more about Keir Hardie here: <http://spartacus-educational.com/PRhardie.htm>

And lots of information on political parties here: <http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/british-politics/political-parties/>

What if this doesn’t happen?

Some people argue that we should have no political parties, but that would make it very difficult to choose a leader, or provide any coherent plan for government. Imagine 650 individually elected and independent MPs turning up after the election to work out what to do next.

Some countries only have one political party. They may still hold elections, but people don’t really have much choice. For example in North Korea there is effectively one-party The Democratic Front for the Reunification of Korea, and whilst there are four other parties named, all the candidates have to be approved by the Democratic Front. In each area there is only one candidate to vote for!

<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/03/north-korea-elections-guide/358875/>

Resource 2

Briefing 5 – Free media, Tim Berners-Lee

The principle

Free media ensures information and a range of opinions are widely spread.

In a democracy it is important that citizens can find out what is going on, so they can form an opinion of the government, and decide if they are doing a good job. It's also important that people know what other parties and candidates propose to do differently. If you have information you can make an informed choice.

The person

Tim Berners-Lee, Inventor of the Internet

In the past information was passed on through books, newspapers, radio, TV and conversations. Governments often banned speakers or books they didn't agree with, but in a democracy this is quite rare. Organisations like the BBC try to be neutral between different political parties and during elections they show party political broadcasts from all the main parties so voters can hear a range of messages.

Now we have the Internet, which makes more information more easily available to more people than ever before. However, it also creates new ways for others to control what we see. It's easier for large companies, and sometimes governments, to promote certain information and make it difficult to find other stuff. Tim Berners-Lee has said: "When you make something universal it can be used for good things or nasty things, we just have to make sure it's not undercut by any large companies or governments trying to use it and get total control."

Further research

For some of Tim Berners-Lee's current thinking: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/mar/11/tim-berners-lee-web-inventor-save-internet>

For more ideas about how important information is in a democracy: <https://www.cartercenter.org/news/documents/doc1860.html>

What if this doesn't happen?

If you don't have access to information then it's easy to get a one-sided view of what's happening. This means you don't know when the government is getting things wrong, or you don't even know about some problems at all. In China, which is a one-party state, the government controls the internet so citizens only get limited information.

<http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/story?id=4707107&page=1>

Resource 2

Briefing 6 – Rule of Law, Lord Bingham of Cornhill

The principle

The rule of law.

In a democracy it is important that the laws that are passed by parliament are implemented fairly. This means people can live their lives relatively freely and that everyone's human rights are respected. This means government makes the law, but independent judges and magistrates interpret the law. This division of power between politicians and the courts is important because it provides a limit on the government's power.

The person

Tom Bingham, Lord Bingham of Cornhill

Tom Bingham was a judge who held two of the most important legal jobs in the country. He was the Lord Chief Justice – the head of the whole justice system of England and Wales; and also Senior Law Lord, when the House of Lords operated as the highest court in the country. In 2009 the House of Lords powers were transferred to a Supreme Court, which Tom Bingham also helped to establish.

For Bingham, there are some important rules a fair legal system should have:

1. The law must be straightforward and easy to understand.
2. The courts should apply the law and not grant favours to anyone.
3. The law should apply equally to all.
4. Ministers and public officers should exercise their power within the law.
5. The law must protect human rights.
6. People should have access to the courts to resolve their disputes.
7. Fair trial.
8. Countries should also comply with their international obligations.

Further research

There is a video about the rule of law here:

<https://binghamcentre.biicl.org/schools/ruleoflaw>

What if this doesn't happen?

If you don't have the rule of law then it means people do not feel their freedom is guaranteed. This also undermines democracy because people do not feel they can trust others – anyone could get locked up or mistreated or forced to pay bribes to protect themselves.

Zimbabwe is frequently criticized for not following the rule of law, and especially for arresting people who are trying to criticize the government and campaign for democracy. You can read about some of the recent arrests and incidents here:

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/africa/zimbabwe/report-zimbabwe/>

Resource 2

Briefing 7 – Freedom of assembly of citizens, Lech Walesa

The principle

Freedom of assembly for citizens and the freedom to organise.

If people are free in a democracy, that means they are free to organise groups together, to meet together, and to campaign for what they want. The government should expect organisations to form with different opinions. Some of these groups remain small and do not achieve much, but some of them become important sources of new ideas and new answers to problems. These freedoms stop society getting stuck in old-fashioned ways of doing things by generating new ideas.

The person

Lech Walesa, Leader of Solidarity and President of Poland (1990-95).

After the Second World War Poland became a Communist state run by one political party, and heavily dependent on the USSR (Russia). Throughout this period, there were a number of illegal organisations that tried to organise opposition to the government. In particular, a trade union emerged to represent the interests of the Polish workers called Solidarity. The government started a crackdown against Solidarity in 1981 and arrested the leadership and 5,000 supporters. The armed forces appeared on the streets and when union members tried to go on strike they were beaten and forced back to work. A public demonstration against the government was attacked by the armed forces and 9 people were killed and 22 injured. Arrests and attacks continued over the next few years and the movement was forced into secret. Lech Walesa, one of Solidarity's leaders received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1983. Finally, as the government experienced more and more problems, they legalized Solidarity in 1989, and by the end of that year Solidarity had won elections and formed the government. In 1990 Lech Walesa became the first democratically elected President of Poland.

Further research

You can read more about Walesa's work here:

<https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/1983/walesa/biographical/>

And you can read more about the struggles to defend the right to association here:

<https://www.frontlinedefenders.org/en/right/freedom-association>

What if this doesn't happen?

If people can't join together to share their ideas and try to influence others then their democratic freedoms are limited. That means some ideas are prevented from being spread. It also means some campaigns are stopped. This means people's freedom to try to pursue the change they want is also limited and that means the power of the government over the people grows.

In Saudi Arabia it is illegal for unrelated men and women to 'mingle' socially, even in a private home.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2009/WORLD/meast/03/09/saudi.arabia.lashes/index.html>

Resource 2

Briefing 8 – Minority Rights, Darcus Howe

The principle

Minority Rights

If elections were all that mattered, then any government that represented the majority of people could do whatever they wanted. However, this would be unfair to anyone in the minority. Therefore, another important aspect of a democracy is respect for minority rights. This guarantees that everyone will have their democratic freedom respected, even though a majority might not approve of aspects of a minority lifestyle or belief.

The person

Darcus Howe, journalist and activist

Darcus Howe was an important leader of the Civil Rights Movement in Britain. As a young man he experienced racism in London. He worked in a Caribbean restaurant in Notting Hill called The Mangrove, and police raided it repeatedly. The police said they were looking for drugs but they never found any and never arrested anyone. In 1970, after 12 such raids, Darcus Howe and others organised a protest against the police. The protest of 150 people ended with a violent clash with police, who had mobilized 700 officers, and they charged the 'Mangrove Nine' for incitement to riot. Howe conducted his own defence and none of the defendants were found guilty of incitement to riot. The judge made history by concluding that the trial had "regrettably shown evidence of racial hatred on both sides." This was the first time the government had to admit the police force was behaving in a racist manner towards black people.

Darcus Howe continued a life of activism, arguing passionately that the London Riots in 2011 were partly explained by the police force's continued insistence on stopping and searching young black people without good cause, and alienating them from the authorities. He constantly struggled to challenge racism and improve the rights of black people in Britain.

Further research

There are two videos of Howe here: <https://youtu.be/-CQw4fZ8oXA> and here: <https://youtu.be/Xdjr64bBosg>
You can read more here: <http://www.ourmigrationstory.org.uk/oms/darcus-howe-and-britains-black-power-movement>

What if this doesn't happen?

Minority rights are restricted all over the world. The point about a democracy is that it should be committed to tackle these restrictions and improve equality. Failure to do this limits the ability of the government to claim to govern for everyone, it also undermines the claim to be a free and fair society.

In 2017 the Chechnyan government began a violent series of attacks against LGBT people. <https://www.rferl.org/a/chechnya-gay-human-rights-watch-torture-abuse-kadyrov-report/28509223.html>

Resource 2

Briefing 9 – Equality for Women, Sophia Duleep Singh

The principle

Equal citizenship rights for women.

You can't have a democracy unless all citizens have equal rights and have a free vote. But in many democracies, women were not allowed to vote until quite a long time after men had the vote. When everyone has a say in choosing the government, those in government have more reason to act in the interests of both men and women.

The person

Sophia Duleep Singh, Suffragette

Princess Sophia Duleep Singh was the daughter of Maharaja Duleep Singh, the last Maharaja of the Sikh Empire. She was brought up in Britain and Queen Victoria was her godmother. She was a leading member of the Suffragettes movement and sold newspapers, helped organise meetings and marches, and withheld her taxes as a form of protest. She was fined for avoiding taxes, had some property confiscated by bailiffs and tried to throw herself in front of the Prime Minister's car as a protest. She was never arrested, some have suggested this is because the authorities did not want to deal with the embarrassment of arresting someone so close to the Queen.

In 1928 she became President of the Committee of the Suffragette Fellowship and she also auctioned off some of her belongings to support the Women's Tax Resistance League, whose motto was, 'No Vote, No Tax!'

"When the women of England are enfranchised I shall pay my taxes willingly. If I am not a fit person for the purposes of representation, why should I be a fit person for taxation?"

Further research

You can read more about Princess Sophia Duleep Singh here: <http://historysheroes.e2bn.org/hero/whowerethey/3521>

You can read a Suffragette speech here: <https://www.theguardian.com/theguardian/2007/apr/27/greatspeeches>

What if this doesn't happen?

A democracy that denies half the population equal rights can't really be considered a democracy, but it's amazing how long it took for that happen around the world. Getting the vote is just the first step though. The next challenge is to ensure women have equal access to stand for elections and then equal access to be elected. If democracy is based on equal rights and an equal voice, we need to think about why it's not fully equal and what that means.

There's an article about Japan's problems with gender equality in politics here, women make up less than 10% of parliament, one of the lowest figures in the world: <http://theconversation.com/japans-politics-is-opening-up-to-women-but-dont-expect-a-feminist-revolution-yet-67243>

Resource 3

Action cards



A. Voluntary work

Find an organisation that is directly helping people or dealing with this issue and volunteer to help them. E.g. if you're worried about poverty, help with a food bank.

B. Direct action

Just do whatever needs to be done yourself. E.g. if your park is run down and dirty, go and clean it up.

C. Vigilantism

Take responsibility for your own security. E.g. if the streets in your neighbourhood are unsafe, set up a group to monitor the streets to protect people.

D. Donating money

Give money to an organisation which is dealing with the problem you have identified. E.g. if you're worried that homeless people are in danger during the winter, donate to a shelter or soup kitchen.

E. Signing a petition

It's quick and easy to sign your name or just click a petition on the Internet. E.g. the website 38 degrees has petitions on all sorts of things.

F. Express solidarity

Sometimes it's useful just to let activists and campaigners know that you appreciate what they are doing and are thinking of them. E.g. writing a letter to someone who is campaigning for LGBT rights in Uganda under the threat of violence.

G. Voting

Once you are old enough to vote in elections, vote for a party or candidate who supports the kind of causes you think are important.

H. Sharing information

Do your bit to spread the word about a campaign or a problem to encourage others to think about it and possibly get involved. E.g. putting up posters or giving a talk in assembly.

I. Wearing a badge and raising awareness

Just putting a badge on your school bag lets people know you support a cause. E.g. people changed their Facebook photo to a French flag when the Paris bombings took place.

J. Marching and protesting

Go out and march to let the world know there are lots of people who agree with the cause. E.g. young people protesting against student loans by marching near Parliament.

K. Lobbying

Contacting someone in power to ask them to support your cause or take specific action. E.g. writing to your local MP or going to meet them in their local surgery.

L. Standing for election

Can't find a political party or candidate to support in an election? Stand yourself and try to change things. E.g. Martin Bell stood because he wanted to teach his local MP a lesson and won!

Resource 3

Action cards



M. Local political party

Join the local branch of a political party and help them to drum up support. E.g. attend meetings, deliver leaflets, knock on doors to let people know what the party is doing.

N. Judicial review or fighting a legal case

If you think the government is being unfair, take them to court. E.g. grouping together with other campaigners to fundraise for a legal action – they can be expensive.

O. Boycott

If you don't agree with a company or policy, don't give them your support, time or money. E.g. avoid companies who don't pay workers the Living Wage or don't buy from companies who sell fur.

P. Refuse to comply

If you think a rule is wrong, refuse to follow it – you have to be prepared for the consequences though. E.g. people refused to pay the poll tax because they thought it was unfair and were sent to prison.

Q. Occupation

Take over a space to protest. E.g. The Occupy movement took over the square outside of St Paul's Cathedral in London to draw attention to inequalities and the power of big business.

R. Hacktivism

Get into someone's website and disrupt their business. E.g. the group Anonymous undermines ISIS's websites by replacing propaganda videos with adverts for Viagra!

S. Sabotage and disruption

Stop people doing what you disagree with. E.g. animal rights protestors sabotage hunts to prevent animal cruelty.

T. Humour

Make people look silly in an attempt to undermine their position and discourage others from supporting them. E.g. put on a comedy show about someone to turn them into a laughing stock.

U. Forcing the legal system to confront injustices

Doing something deliberately to get into trouble with the law so that you can have your day in court. E.g. people who trespass on airport runways to protest about the pollution caused by the expansion of airports and air travel.

V. Political violence towards the authorities

Deliberately set out to use violence against the police or government. E.g. the IRA bombing Parliament.

W. Political violence towards civilians

Deliberately set out to use violence against other citizens. E.g. beating up people who wear fur.

X. Riots

Protest where the anger and confrontation leads to people destroying buildings and businesses. E.g. some of the protesters involved in marching against the increase in university tuition fees.

Resource 4

Scenario card 1 – Women’s Rights

Campaign objectives

The suffragettes operated in the UK in the late 1800s and early 1900s. At this time there was a democratic system of government but women were not allowed to vote. Their objective was to force the government to give women the vote as soon as possible.

Instructions

1. Working individually

Choose three action cards you think would be useful in relation to their campaign.

What tactic do you think they should reject and why?

Action 1	Action 2	Action 3
Why should they use this tactic?		
How would it work to achieve their objectives?		

2. Working with others who have the same issue

Compare your answers and discuss whether there seems to be one action that stands out for them as the best to use to achieve their objectives.

What have you chosen and why do you think it would be the most effective tactic for them to use?

3. Comparing your answers with people who are working on different issues

Are there any methods that seem generally useful across the causes?

Are there some that you would not use at all? Why?

Does breaking the law make a difference to your judgement about this? Why?

Resource 4

Scenario card 2 – Animal Rights

Campaign objectives

The Animal Liberation Front exists to end abuse and cruelty to animals. In this campaign they want to put an end to fur farming. Think about what a member of this network might choose as the most effective form of action.

Instructions

1. Working individually

Choose three action cards you think would be useful in relation to their campaign.

What tactic should they reject and why?

Action 1	Action 2	Action 3
Why should they use this tactic?		
How would it work to achieve their objectives?		

2. Working with others who have the same issue

Compare your answers and discuss whether there seems to be one action that stands out for them as the best to use to achieve the campaign objectives.

What have you chosen and why do you think it would be the most effective tactic for them to use?

3. Comparing your answers with people who are working on different issues

Are there any methods that seem generally useful across the causes?

Are there some that you think they should not use at all? Why?

Does breaking the law make a difference to your judgement about this? Why?

Resource 4

Scenario card 3 – Anti-fascists

Campaign objectives

The Anti-fascist Network exists to make sure that far-right and racist campaigners are always challenged and demonstrate that the number of people against such ideas is greater than the number for them. Their ultimate goal is to make sure the far right cannot build a power base in local communities. Think about what a member of this network might choose as the most effective form of action.

Instructions

1. Working individually

Choose three action cards you think would be useful in relation to their campaign.

What tactic should they reject and why?

Action 1	Action 2	Action 3
Why should they use this tactic?		
How would it work to achieve their objectives?		

2. Working with others who have the same issue

Compare your answers and discuss whether there seems to be one action that stands out for them as the best to use to achieve their objectives.

What have you chosen and why do you think it would be the most effective tactic for them to use?

3. Comparing your answers with people who are working on different issues

Are there any methods that seem generally useful across the causes?

Are there some that you think they should not use at all? Why?

Does breaking the law make a difference to your judgement about this? Why?

Resource 5

Deliberative debate – free to act?

Keep a note of how the statement changes here.

Motion: "Citizens in a democracy are free to undertake any actions to bring about change so long as they are within the law."

You have already thought about a range of actions that may or may not be justifiable. It may also be useful to do some further reading to prepare for the whole class discussion:

Article 1: When breaking the law is justified
https://www.thestar.com/news/insight/2011/06/10/when_breaking_the_law_is_justified.html

Article 2: Why do we obey the law?
<https://bit.ly/2Rzsp2A>

1. Considering the arguments against the motion

First of all, think of any examples of citizen action which is illegal but justifiable.

Now try to think about why they are justifiable, even though they were illegal.

Go round the class to collect all the examples and any other reasons people can think of why they may not entirely agree with this statement.

2. Considering the arguments for the motion

Then go back round the class considering all the arguments for this statement.

Then take a vote – how many for / against / abstentions.

3. Refining the motion

Your goal is to get the whole class, or as many of them as possible, to agree a final statement. In order to reach agreement, you may need to make some amendments or qualifications to the statement.

An amendment is a change to the motion. This can involve completely changing the wording, or adding or taking away something specific. The intention is to find a form of words more people can agree with.

Resource 6

Stimulus cards



Amendment 1. Add to the end of the motion: “Unless the law is wrong, unfair, or promotes inequality.”

This amendment focuses on the law rather than the action itself.

- Think about examples of laws in the past which were unfair and which were challenged by illegal protest.
- Think about unfair laws today that could be challenged?
- How would you know a law was unjust?
- Who decides and how?

Amendment 2. Add to the end of the motion: “Unless the action causes more harm than good.”

This amendment focuses on the effect of the action in practice, not on whether it is right or wrong in principle.

- Think about examples from the past that have led to some harm but were acceptable or even celebrated later.
This could include harm to property, bad feeling etc.
- Think about examples where you think the negative effects outweighed any positive impact.
- How would you decide what was acceptable?

Amendment 3. Add to the end of the motion: “As long as no-one is hurt.”

This amendment focuses only on whether the action leads to harm to a person, not to property or other interests.

- Think about examples where people have been hurt but the action was justified – why was this the case? Did it prevent other people being harmed?
- Think about examples where people were hurt but the outcomes weren’t successful anyway.
- Think about whether you can ever really justify hurting people.

Amendment 4. Add to the end of the motion: “And the people committing those acts shouldn’t be punished.”

This is not about the act, it’s about what happens to people after they have done it.

- Think about how people are normally punished for breaking the law.
- Think about cases where people are not punished.
- Think about what would happen to the law if you could break it without consequence.

Amendment 5. Add to the end of the motion: “And the people committing those acts should be punished.”

This is not about the act, it’s about what happens to people after they have done it.

- Think about how people are normally punished for breaking the law.
- Think about cases where people are not punished.
- Think about what would happen to the law if you could break it without consequence.

Resource 7



1. Put up posters criticising the government for not granting women the vote. Try to educate people so they support the campaign. The Suffragettes produced some powerful posters as part of their campaigning, including slogans like 'Justice Demands the Vote' and 'Equality is the Sacred Law of Humanity'.

2. Arrange meetings with members of Parliament who support the cause to encourage them to take the issue up with the government. The Suffragettes had enough support in Parliament to introduce thirteen Bills between 1867-89 to keep the issue on the agenda. MPs like Peter McLagan gave high profile support to the campaign.

3. The Suffragettes organised large marches through cities to promote their cause. One historian has written: "The suffrage marches drew thousands of participants, starting with the three thousand in February 1907—the 'Mud March'—and ending with forty thousand at the last in 1913, but more important they drew vast crowds (hundreds of thousands) and press coverage."
(Deborah Gardener, 1989)

4. In 1913 the Suffragettes' campaign became more militant. Sylvia Pankhurst wrote about some of the new campaign strategies: "Street lamps were broken, house numbers were painted out, chairs flung in the river, cushions of railway carriages slashed, flower-beds damaged, golf greens all over the country scraped and burnt with acid... Thirteen pictures were hacked in the Manchester Art Gallery."

5. In 1913 Emily Davison threw herself under the King's horse at the Epsom Race Course. She died of her injuries.

6. In 1913-14 Suffragettes also started planting bombs. They wrecked the Prime Minister's week-end home, damaged the Coronation Chair in Westminster Abbey and planted other bombs in St Paul's Cathedral and near the Bank of England.

Resource 7



7. Animal Rights groups produce badges to help spread their message. Popular slogans include: 'Meat is Murder' and 'If you love animals don't eat them.'

8. Animal rights campaigners have written to MPs to encourage them to make the penalties more severe for animal cruelty (for example, greater fines or longer prison sentences).

9. Animal rights campaigners in Devon have been holding vigils outside of slaughter houses. They say this allows them to 'bear witness' to the murders of the animals and also to make recordings to use in their campaigning work to make sure people know how their meat is produced.

10. A group called the Vegan Vandals have been putting graffiti around nature reserves in Hertfordshire. Messages on information boards include: 'I stopped drinking cow's milk when I realised I wasn't a cow' and 'Not your mum, not your milk'.

11. The Animal Liberation Front's website declares they will use all tactics necessary to free animals and end animal cruelty including "illegal raids, rescues, and sabotage attacks." Members of the ALF sometimes raid fur farms, break open the cages and allow animals to escape.

12. Animal rights activists have broken into university laboratories and destroyed equipment, they have set light to a researcher's car, and turned up at scientists' homes in the night to threaten their families.

Resource 7



13. The Anti-fascist Network uses social media such as Facebook to spread information and help to organise their movement.

14. Campaigners called for a radio presenter to be sacked for using language they perceived to be racist.

15. A group of anti-fascist activists blockaded the entrance to a hotel where a group was planning to meet. According to the activists the group was a neo-Nazi white supremacist organisation and they aimed to prevent the meeting from going ahead.

16. A gallery displaying material from alt-right groups was forced to close because of constant acts of vandalism from anti-fascist activists. They repeatedly broke windows and put graffiti on the walls.

17. A group of anti-fascists targeted a controversial historian who was widely seen as a defender of Hitler. The activists took down his website and hacked his emails and published private messages online to embarrass him.

18. Some anti-fascist activists organise counter-demonstrations whenever far-right groups organise a march or rally. They aim to disrupt them and the clashes often become violent. One anti-fascist group justifies it like this: "Attempts by fascist groups to recruit members to fascism cannot be tolerated. If such groups are not smashed when they are small, they will inevitably grow to a size where they will feel confident enough to attack immigrants, workers' organisations, etc."

Resource 8

Can violence be justified?

Andrew Valls is an Associate Professor of Political Science in Oregon State University in the USA. He has written about the question 'Can Terrorism Be Justified?' and argues that we can use the framework below to come to a decision about whether the use of violence is ever acceptable.

1. Just cause, such as defending oneself against aggression.
2. Legitimate authority, in other words the people using violence genuinely represent the interests of others, and are not simply acting for narrow or personal reasons.
3. Right intention, to defend a principle of justice rather than seeking to exploit others.

4. Last resort, other reasonable types of action have been fully explored.
5. Probability of success, which means it would be wrong to run the risk of violence unless there were some reasonable expectation that it might have some positive outcomes.
6. Proportionality, meaning the benefit should be worth the cost. Given the known harms of using violence, this is difficult to achieve.

Choose one of the scenarios that involved the use of violence and try to apply these six factors to your example. Write down your thoughts in the table below.

	The scenario I have chosen is...
1. Just cause Do you think this is an important enough issue to consider the use of violence?	
2. Legitimate authority Are the people taking action acting on behalf of others?	
3. Right intention Is the action to promote justice rather than taking power?	
4. Last resort Have people tried every other reasonable method?	
5. Probability of success Is there a reasonable chance of success? If not the violence might just make things worse	
6. Proportionality Would the outcome be worth the pain and suffering caused?	

Having considered these six factors, do you think the use of violence in this scenario is justified?

Resource 9

Debate motion: “This house believes the use of violence is justified in this case”

Step 1 – Choose your issue

As a class we will decide which of the scenarios you are going to focus on.

Step 2 – Organise roles

Choose a team of speakers to argue for the motion and a team to speak against it.

You will also need to choose a time-keeper and a chairperson to manage the debate.

Step 3 – Prepare

The people speaking will need to prepare their arguments and organise their speeches.

Others will be members of the audience and can prepare by discussing the issues and identifying questions or key points to raise from the floor.

Two ways to think about the motion are suggested in the shaded boxes opposite:

Step 4 – Debate

Start with a speaker supporting the motion, then move on to a speaker from the opposing side, then the speakers continue to take it in turns to present their arguments.

Then the audience can make their own additional points, or ask questions of speakers.

Finally take a vote to see which position reflects the majority’s opinion.

Step 5 – Reflection

Come back together as a class to consider what the most important arguments were and whether anyone was surprised by the outcome and why.

(a) Think about the general arguments for and against the use of violence. The following quotations may help you start to think about this.

"If violence is wrong in America, violence is wrong abroad. If it's wrong to be violent defending Black women and Black children and Black babies and Black men, then it's wrong for America to draft us and make us violent abroad in defence of her. And if it is right for America to draft us, and teach us how to be violent in defence of her, then it is right for you and me to do whatever is necessary to defend our own people right here in this country."

(Malcom X, 1963, arguing that the Civil Rights Movement could no longer afford to pursue a non-violent strategy in the USA)

"The practice of violence, like all action, changes the world, but the most probable change is a more violent world."

(Hannah Arendt, a philosopher who attended the trial of Eichmann (a leading Nazi) and wrote a book called 'On Violence')

"I believed then that terror had to be answered with terror and I authorized high profile massacres on white civilians in the same way that the whites did on us. At the time it seemed the only valid response - but where would it have ended?"

(Letlapa Mphahlele was Director of Operations of Apla, the military wing of the Pan Africanist Congress, during Apartheid in South Africa)

There are longer speeches available:

Nelson Mandela defends the use of violence against the apartheid government:

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2013/12/05/read-the-most-important-speech-nelson-mandela-ever-gave/?utm_term=.2bfef7e91f31

Gandhi makes the case for non-violence:

<http://vgrossen.tripod.com/americanreads/id10.html>

(b) Think about the arguments about violence in this specific context.

Here you may find it useful to use Valls' six factors to think through your analysis.

1. Just cause - Do you think this is an important enough issue to consider the use of violence?
2. Legitimate authority - Are the people taking action, acting on behalf of others?
3. Right intention - Is the action to promote justice rather than taking power?
4. Last resort - Have people tried every other reasonable method?
5. Probability of success - Is there a reasonable chance of success? If not the violence might just make things worse
6. Proportionality - Would the outcome be worth the pain and suffering caused?

Resource 10

Instructions for the Chairperson and Timekeeper

The Chairperson and Timekeeper are very important roles in each debate as they help to make sure that everything goes smoothly, and according to the rules. The following aims to provide some structure to help.

The Chairperson's first job is to make sure that the speakers are set up ready to speak. They might sit in the following positions: the Chairperson and Timekeeper in the center, the opposition speakers (against the motion) together on one side, and the proposition speakers (in favour of the motion) together on the other side. All speakers should be facing the audience.

The sequence of the debate is as follows:

- First proposition speaker
- First opposition speaker
- Second proposition speaker
- Second opposition speaker
- Floor debate with audience
- Summary opposition speech
- Summary proposition speech

Next, the debate starts. The Chairperson could use a gavel (wooden hammer) to get the audience's attention. The traditional words to say next are "I call this House to order". Then, the Chairperson should:

- Announce what the 'motion' (topic) for debate is
- Introduce the speakers for the proposition and opposition by naming them and saying who will be speaking first, second and in summary.
- Briefly set out the format of the debate, perhaps by using the following standing orders.

Standing Orders in brief

This debate will consist of six speeches.

The four main speeches will each be 3 minutes long. Then there will be an opportunity for the audience to ask questions and make their own comments. The final summary speeches will be two minutes long.

When the time is up for each speaker the timekeeper will make their signal (for example ringing a bell), then the speaker must finish as soon as possible.

After the four main speeches you, the audience, can make brief comments in the floor debate. Speakers will not respond to these points, but the people making the summary speeches at the end may choose to respond to some points raised during this discussion.

After the final 2 minute summary speeches from each side the class will vote on the amended motion at the end of the debate.

Then the Chairperson calls on the first speaker, and continue until the first four speeches have happened.

Resource 10

Instructions for the Chairperson and Timekeeper

The floor debate

Following the second opposition speech, there is a floor debate. The Chairperson asks the audience members to raise their hands if they have a point they want to make. 'Points from the floor' may be phrased as statements or questions. The Chairperson asks people to stand up when they make floor points. Floor speeches should be not too long and as many people as possible should have an opportunity to have their say.

The Chairperson should use their own judgement on how long the floor debate should last. 5 to 10 minutes is a good length.

Summary speeches

The Chairperson invites the person summarising the opposition position to speak first, and then end with the final speech for the proposal.

The audience vote

The vote takes place at the end of the debate on the revised proposal. The Chairperson asks for a show of hands for / against / abstaining.

Keeping order

In order to keep order during the debate, the Chairperson is allowed to intervene if any of the speakers or members of the audience are being rude, abusive or going against one of the rules of the debate. For example, he/she might have to intervene if speakers:

- Go over their time limit by more than 25 seconds
- Or are rude about an individual on the opposition side.

Timing the speeches

The Timekeeper should time each speech with a stopwatch and knock clearly (or ring a bell) to give time signals to the speakers to help them during their speech. These should be one knock / ring when there are 30 seconds left, and two knocks / rings at the end of their time.

These classroom resources have been written to accompany the teachers' pack 'The Deliberative Classroom: Democracy, Protest and Change.'

The materials were written by the Association for Citizenship Teaching, Middlesex University and the English Speaking Union (January 2019).

Cover image courtesy of Magharebia on Flickr 'Algerians defy protest ban' Feb, 2011