



961

AP Language

Mr. Pogreba

8 October 2017

Civil Disobedience for All

One in every ten Americans identifies as LGBTQ+. That means over 30 million people, or three New York Cities. For years they lived in secret, hiding from themselves and others. But they were defiant. Many wore rings on their fingers and held Pride Parades in the cities and protested in the streets and never stopped believing that the day would come when they had the same rights as the other 90% of the population. **They were convicted of gross indecency, which ruined many careers; they broke out of conversion facilities that proclaimed what existed in their DNA was a choice or a form of mental illness; they went out in public and held hands proudly during a time when anti-sodomy laws were still in place all over the US. And their day of victory did come.** In 2015, it became legal for anyone of any gender and/or sexuality to marry whom they chose. There are many ways to fight for rights without violence: civil disobedience is one of them. It is difficult to think about what actions take civil disobedience too far, or to know which laws are acceptable to break, but civil disobedience has been effective in the past in procuring rights and privileges; in addition, people must break laws if the laws interfere with morality.

This is oddly phrased. I'm not sure the issue is thinking about it?

Remember, topic sentence needs to better address your point of view, not what others think.

Initially, many people question which laws can be broken, and many people take their law-breaking too far in their quest for a given definition of freedom. These two points are often connected. Murder for the sake of freedom is never morally correct. All other

avenues must be exhausted before a full-blown war occurs. In addition, the social acceptability of law-breaking depends on what exactly a person is breaking the laws for. Breaking and entering someone's workplace and destroying their merchandise to protest a supposedly unfair business contract is not the way to handle the situation. Discussion can solve so many problems if conducted correctly. It is when discussion fails after many attempts that civil disobedience can even be imagined, much less seriously considered.

This TP should
Probably take a
stronger
touch
from
outset
and
claim
some
lawbreaking
cannot
be
justified

↳ Throughout history, civil disobedience has been an essential step in the journey toward freedom. From the Boston Tea Party, in which members of the American colonies protested against the preposterously high tax on tea, to the Underground Railroad, which allowed slaves to escape their brutal masters, events like this compose the true victories in the epic of the American past. The Boston Tea Party showed Britain that despite the passage of many laws restricting the colonies' trade and economy, the residents of the colonies would continue to fight for their livelihoods in America and their right to be treated just as well as any British-born citizen. The Underground Railroad allowed former slaves to go into the Northern cities, telling their stories about how badly they were treated by their owners, getting educated in order to build a new life, and taking their pleas for freedom all the way up to President Lincoln. Beyond America, South Africa and India have their own triumphs in the fight for equality, also through civil disobedience. All races and ages have gained something from disobeying laws to further a common goal.

Transition
needs to
link last
TP to
this
one

Focus on
the
law breaking
and
its morality

(Transition) If laws are morally reprehensible or indefensible, they should be broken. There were laws in Germany that Jews couldn't own businesses and all children had to learn Hitler's values in school. This led to the massacre of 6 million Jews and millions of other people deemed less than

human by the dictatorship, including, but not limited to, the Polish, Gypsies, and homosexuals. Children indoctrinated in Hitler's ideals went on to become part of the SS or the German army, sent to kill for the sake of a madman and his cronies. Was it morally correct to aid in mass murder and brainwashing? No. Women weren't allowed to vote in America until 1920. That meant 50% of a representative democracy had no voice, nor a part in political decisions. Some women stole their husband's ballots to vote or registered under false names and mailed in their ballots in order to have any sort of sway in government decisions. Was it morally correct to silence a whole gender for the purpose of maintaining male chauvinism and power? No. Abraham Lincoln stated in an 1838 document, "...while [bad laws] continue in force, they should be religiously observed." Although this was written twenty-five years before he abolished slavery, that doesn't mean what he says is acceptable. He even acknowledges the laws are bad ones; how can he support laws that he knows are bad and tell others to do the same? **Especially laws that, at the time, treated black slaves as lesser than white landowners.** Through this action, Lincoln becomes the leader of the lemmings, and he tells all the citizens of the US to jump off of the cliff of oppression with him. Notably, in the 20th century, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights cannot be overlooked when discussing laws that should be broken. Enacted after the Holocaust by America and many other countries, it lists rights that can never be taken away from people, no matter where they live or who they are. The articles state that everyone has the right to get married and have children, a fair and speedy trial by a judge and a jury of their peers, to leave their country and return to their country, and many others that make common sense but are sadly ignored even in America. **Most of these articles revolve around a common purpose: to keep all citizens of the world safe and healthy. When a law jeopardizes**

I'd do
a bit
more to
condemn
the moral
wrong of
laws
that
do
this

a person's safety, such as a law making slavery legal, that law can be broken. When a law jeopardizes a person's mental well-being, such as the laws allowing conversion camps for LGBTQ citizens, those laws can be broken. When a law affects a society's social groups, such as a law separating black students from white students and giving the far better education to the latter, that law can be broken. After nearly seventy years, these rights should be just as inalienable as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Any law that obstructs freedom for all should be fought with everything, including breaking said laws.

good
use of
epistrophe

Marriage is at its heart a legal contract, and that contract can be completed by two consenting adults with witnesses. In the eyes of the law, there was no reason for the gay marriage bill to take as long to pass as it did. But now, the bill can be added to the succession of conquests America has made in its mission for equality of all citizens. Now, there is no pointless or ludicrous law keeping everyone from marrying whom they choose. And now, most importantly, American society has finally caught up with Europe, restoring its one true prerogative of being the most morally correct. In today's world, America must fight once more to keep themselves from drowning in a sea of injustice that was once held back. Hopefully civil disobedience will continue to be an important tradition. Otherwise, people may have bigger problems than a few minor run-ins with the law.