When a cancerous tumour is growing in our body, we use chemotherapy to treat it. I hear chemo isn’t much fun, but having said that, I’d take it in a second if it meant that it might save my life. So likewise, when a cancerous tumour is growing in our society, we must also take swift, albeit potentially painful and difficult action to deal with it. While a non-violent approach to a revolution is usually an ideal one, it’s ignorant to think that it’s always possible to get your way through peaceful means. You think the American colonists asked the British government for independence nicely? The world isn’t a nice enough place and its residents aren’t smart enough to settle everything with words. If you can’t get your ideas into someone’s brain, get a bullet in there instead. I think violence is a perfectly acceptable method to bring about revolution. The bigger problem comes later. If you are able to make a change, but only through force, will it really last? There’s no such thing as right or wrong in this world, only different points of view. So even if the entire world is against you, if you somehow manage to forcefully get everyone to conform to your ideals, then you’re in the right, and the revolution was a success. But ultimately if people don’t believe in your ideals, the second you’re gone, things will just go back to how they were before. Violence is only used in the context of a revolution when a group of people don’t believe in what the revolters are revolting for. And if there are people who don’t believe in your ideals, then there will always be a certain degree of unrest in the society, and another revolution could occur. So what’s my answer? Violence is 100% acceptable in the context of a revolution. To what extent? Take it however far you want. Towards whom? Who cares, anyone you want. Ultimately we fight for what we believe is right. But if you have to fight to get it, how long will it last?