

Extremism in the defence of liberty is no vice and moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue

I. Introduction:

Thesis statement:

Failure of moderation in addressing injustice proves the necessities for taking extreme measures in defending liberty.

II. Explaining the quote: Barry Goldwater

III. Why extremism is justified in defending liberty, while moderation is not:

A. Failure of moderation in addressing deep-seated injustices promotes extremist efforts for success.

(Moderate action against climate change worsening globe)

B. Urgency in de-escalating the crisis requires extreme actions

(Intervention in Kosovo 1990's
Genocide)

C. For breaking the status quo, extreme efforts are justified
(Martin Luther King Jr.'s
stance against racial injustice)

D. For broader societal change, extreme measures act as catalyst

E. Extreme actions against injustices serve as deterrent to future violation

(Protection of human rights)

F. Extremism ensures comprehensive change while moderation leads to partial reform

(Radical land reforms in post-revolutionary China eradicated)

feudalism)

G. In depending the moral principles, extremism becomes necessity

(Engaging in a civil war was necessary to end slavery)

H. In combating authoritarianism, extreme actions are pivotal in defence

(The velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia)

I. Extremism draws quick response which moderation cannot draw (Greenpeace's bold environmental activism draws global attention towards climate change)

J. Marginalized segments have the only resort to highlight their concerns through extremism; moderation goes

unheard.

K. Extreme actions ensure accountability for those in power (The watergate scandal's extreme investigative journalism by the Washington Post led the resignation of president Nixon)

L. To fight against global threats, extremism is justified (Global fight against terrorism)

IV. Conclusion