

2022

The Right to Rebel and the Insurrection at the Capitol: What Causes Support for the Events of January 6th

Tanner Butler

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openspaces.unk.edu/undergraduate-research-journal>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Butler, Tanner (2022) "The Right to Rebel and the Insurrection at the Capitol: What Causes Support for the Events of January 6th," *Undergraduate Research Journal*: Vol. 26, Article 2.

Available at: <https://openspaces.unk.edu/undergraduate-research-journal/vol26/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Undergraduate Research & Creative Activity at OpenSPACES@UNK: Scholarship, Preservation, and Creative Endeavors. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Research Journal by an authorized editor of OpenSPACES@UNK: Scholarship, Preservation, and Creative Endeavors. For more information, please contact weissell@unk.edu.

THE RIGHT TO REBEL AND THE INSURRECTION AT THE CAPITOL: WHAT CAUSES SUPPORT FOR THE EVENTS OF JANUARY 6TH

TANNER BUTLER

MENTOR: Dr. Satoshi Machida, Department of Political Science

ABSTRACT

On January 6th, there was a riot at the Capitol of the United States where protestors attempted to overturn the 2020 Presidential Election. While attempting this, the protestors took over the halls of Congress. This study will be looking at what is causing people to support this political violence. The focus will be to see if people's beliefs that the protestors were within the right to rebel that John Locke lays out in his social contract theory are important for explaining the support for the riot. Survey data provided the basis for statistical analysis that demonstrated a strong connection between belief in the right to rebel and support for the riot. Knowing this, we have a better understanding of why people support political violence. Along with the importance of the normative justification of the right to rebel. The idea that there will be a connection between people supporting political violence and believing the perpetrators are within the right to rebel could be applied to other acts of political violence both in the United States and abroad.

INTRODUCTION

On January 6th, the world was shocked as a riotous mob of protestors illegally entered the Capitol building of the United States of America. They did so to stop Congress from certifying the electors in the 2020 Presidential Election and officially declaring President Biden the victor. The results are not universally accepted, with around 31% of the population believing that President Biden's illegitimately won (Leatherby et al., 2021; The Visual Journalism Team, 2021).

These acts are shocking, especially since they occurred at a symbol for democracy. The question is then posed, why did this historic event occur? This study proposes that one of the key factors for why people are supportive of this act of political violence is their belief that the rioters were acting within the Lockean right to rebel.

This right to rebel has been a prominent idea in American thought, giving it theoretical significance. With the introduction into the American marketplace of ideas coming from the story of the Founding Fathers overthrowing a tyrannical government and invoking this right in the Declaration of Independence. With the mythos around this era in American history, the justification has become romanticized, turning the idea of a right to rebel into a normative justification for political violence in American Society. This was not the founders' original idea; instead, they called upon the work of John Locke (Ladenburg, 2007; O'Toole, 2011; Tate, 2015; Wishy, 1958). Scholars have noted that John Locke's right to rebel has been a classic justification of political violence (Gurr, 1970a), and others have suggested these ideas caused the events of January 6th (Corbould & McDonnell, 2021; Hennessey-Finske, 2021). These works lack empirical evidence for the connection between these beliefs and political violence, which this study fixes.

This connection is one that may be intuitive to many readers and is why scholars have previously argued that these beliefs helped to shape the events of January 6th. This paper helps to both empirically show that there is a connection and more importantly to help illustrate the strength of the support. With a better understanding of the strength in this relationship, future researchers will have a better understanding of how important the Lockean normative beliefs can be for the authorization of political violence in the United States, rather than a more abstract discussion of the role that these norms have played. This study allows for a better understanding of what Locke means today and a glimpse at the importance of the norms surrounding his work.

In the first section, we will be connecting the right to rebel to the literature surrounding political violence. After that, we will investigate Locke's ideas surrounding the right to rebel and the normative impact of this right. Next, we will look at the methodology for the survey that we used to obtain data for this study. We conducted empirical analysis and interpreted the results. We see a strong connection between people's support for the riot and their belief that the rioters were within their rights.

POLITICAL VIOLENCE

To properly understand the events on January 6th, we need to look at the concept of Political Violence. Gurr defines political violence as "...all collective attacks within a political regime, its actors -including competing political groups as well as incumbents or its policies. The goal of this is the attempted use of force or the threat of force for political change" (Gurr, pg. 24b). Gurr postulates that the root cause of political violence is Relative Deprivation, which " ... is defined as actor's perception of discrepancy between their value expectations and their value capabilities." (pg. 24b). The connection between relative deprivation and political violence is causal but not directly related and instead is expressed through other variables (Finkel, Muller & Opp, 1989; Gurr, 1970a; Gurr, 1970b; Muller, 1972; Muller, 1977). This indirect causality can be seen both in theoretical models (Gurr, 1970b) and through empirical analysis (Gurr, 1970a; Muller, 1972; Muller, 1977). Since Gurr's original work, the theory has still been used, with the added idea that it is most applicable when relative deprivation exists between groups (Buhaug, Cederman, & Gleditsch, 2014; Cunningham, 2013; Dyrstad & Hillesund, 2020; Eisinger, 1973; Østby, 2013; Van Zomeren, Spears, Fischer, & Leach, 2004). These works have mainly focused on ethnic groups, but relative deprivation only requires that the groups perceive any gap between them as closeable (Gurr, 1970b).

The results of the 2016 election connect to the theory in that it provides the source for the deprivation. The sources of deprivation are classified into welfare, power, and interpersonal (Gurr, 1970b; Muller, 1972). The welfare category is considered the most salient (Cantril, 1958; Gurr, 1970b), and the results of the 2020 election can be seen as an assault on these values. There are two types of welfare values economic and self-actualization (Gurr, P. 25). Economic deprivation has been the primary focus of study, with there being a strong connection between economic downturns and political violence (Buhaug, Cederman, & Gleditsch, 2014; Davies, 1968; Dyrstad & Hillesund, 2020; Eisinger, 1973). With 44% of Americans believing that President Trump would do a better job with jobs and the economy (Morning Consult & Politico, 2020). The other areas people could have faced deprivation are in the value area, with the participation and security subsections (Gurr, p.26b). These exist because the protestors believe that President Biden's victory was illegitimate. These people would then say their security has been harmed since the government

is corrupt, and they did not get to participate in the election since it was "stolen" (Leatherby et al., 2021; The Visual Journalism Team, 2021). Past research shows that there is a direct connection between the illegitimacy of a regime or electoral unfairness and aggressive political actions, including political violence (Collier, 2004; Dyrstad & Hillesund, 2020; Easton, 1975; Gurr, 1970a; Gurr, 1970b; Muller, 1972; Muller, 1977; Muller & Jukam, 1983; Van Zomeren, et al., 2004). Normally democracies do not have to worry about this since citizens vent their anger in elections, but if the election is perceived as unfair and does not allow for venting of frustrations, democracies deal with violence (Carrey, 2006; Dyrstad & Hillesund, 2020; Eisinger, 1973; Gurr, 1970b; Muller & Jukam, 1983). All of this explains how the scholarship says there could be relative deprivation with the results of the 2020 presidential election, and the perceived failure of the election. These explanations don't need to be reasonable, but if they exist, that creates deprivation in this scenario. Societal norms then factor into whether political violence will occur in situations with relative deprivation.

RIGHT TO REBEL

For relative deprivation to ferment into actual violence, other conditions need to occur, one of the key ones is normative beliefs (Gurr, 1970b, Muller, 1977). This occurs as actors use normative arguments to justify their actions (Gurr, 1970a; O'Boyle, 2002). Violations of inalienable rights have historically been a common justification for political violence (Gurr, 1970a). This work argues that the beliefs around the right to rebel act as the normative justification that cause people to support the events on January 6th.

Now that we have looked at what causes political violence, we need to examine the meaning of the right to rebel that John Locke delineated. The right to rebel evolves from Locke's Social Contract theory presented in the Second Treatises on government (O'Toole, 2011; Tate, 1965; Wishy, 1958). Locke establishes that society, in a state of nature, can form a state by consent. The purpose of these governments is to protect the natural rights of their citizens since the rights cannot be protected in the anarchical state of nature. Since the government is formed by consent, society may revoke this and return to a state of nature (Locke, 2015; O'Toole, 2001). Since society under Locke's Social Contract Theory can exit the contract, there is an inherent right to rebel that does not exist under other social contract theories (Ladenburg, 2007; O'Toole, 2001). Locke does limit this right, arguing that it is only to be used as a last resort when the misery suffered is more than the people would be under the state of nature (Locke, 2015). Locke specifically discusses conditions that society can base the right to rebel on. These will be called the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government and an improperly elected government.

The first right to rebel that we will discuss is the right to rebel against a tyrannical government, which Locke describes as "...an absolute power over the lives, liberty, and estates of the people; by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands for quire contrary ends, and it devolves to the people, who have a right to resume their original liberty..." (pg. 191). Society would be wholly within its right to rebel if the government infringes upon the peoples' natural rights (Locke, 2015; Honoré, 1988). Another justification that Locke gives for the right to rebel is if the government is improperly elected. Locke phrases this as "...When, ..., the electors, or ways of election, are altered, without the consent, and contrary to the common interest of the people...they are not the legislative appointed by the people" (pg. 189). When this occurs, a state of war between society and the government occurs. This state of war is the hallmark of when the right to rebel has been taken up (Locke, 2015). One specific way that

Locke notes that this can happen is when the executive "...openly pre-engages the electors, and prescribes to their choice, such, whom he has, by solicitations, threats, promises, or otherwise, won to his designs; and employs them to bring in such, who have promised before-hand what to vote, and what to enact" (pg.192). The heart of what Locke is stating here is that society can invoke the right to rebel when someone illegitimately won an election.

Locke does put constraints on when society can use the right to rebel under these conditions, saying:

But if a long train of abuses, prevarications and artifices, all tending the same way, make the design visible to the people, and they cannot but feel what they lie under, and see whither they are going; it is not to be wondered, that they should then rouse themselves and endeavor to put into such hands which may secure to them the ends for which government was at first erected; and without which, ancient names, and specious forms, are so far from being better, that they are much worse, than the state of nature, or pure anarchy; the inconveniences being all as great and as near, but the remedy farther off and more difficult (pg. 193)

The goal of Locke is to ensure that every slight issue with government leads to rebellions but only as a last option (Locke, 2015). The question is now when are these conditions met? Locke does not give us an exact answer, only saying that "The people shall be judge..." (pg. 201). Since the people are the ones deciding in all practical sense, it does not matter exactly. The exact intellectual criterion is not as important as the beliefs that the people hold (Wishy, 1958).

All the theory behind the right to rebel is true only as with other rights if society accepts the existence of the said right. The normative belief that the right to rebel exists occurs in the United States due to the influence of the Declaration of Independence (Honoré, 1988). The specific aspects of normative beliefs around the right to rebel that each country has affected how the right is used (Honoré, 1988; Pines, 2008). Knowing this, we need to look at the specific beliefs in the United States, which evolved from the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson based the Declaration of Independence upon the works of Locke in his Second Treatise (Ladenburg, 2007; O'Toole, 2011; Tate, 2015; Wishy, 1958). Jefferson was not the only scholar of Locke, but the study of his theory was prolific throughout colonial America and lead to support for the American Revolution. Cohan, 2005; O'Toole, 2011; Tate, 2015; Wishy, 1958). With the idolization of this period of American History, the ideas survive today (Cohan, 2005; Corbould & McDonnell, 2021; O'Toole, 2011). This normative justification has been used across American history, such as during the Civil War, where Confederate leaders consistently referred to Locke's ideas and the ideas of Locke and the Declaration of Independence (Durden, 1978). Other dissidents, such as American communists, have used these same ideas (Wishy, 1958). Even today, the protestors on the 6th used this normative justification (Corbould & McDonnell, 2021; Hennessey-Finske, 2021). Corbould & McDonnell argue that this was a large part of the justification for the rioters but provide little empirical evidence (2021). In the United States, we see that a majority, 51%, of Americans believe that "if the elected officials do not protect America, people need to" (Jackson & Silverstein, 2021). Polling also demonstrates the survival of the norm with 36% of Americans agreeing with the statement, "the traditional American way of life is disappearing so fast that we may have to use force to save it" and with 39% also agreeing with the statement "if elected officials will not protect America, the people must do it themselves even if it requires taking violent actions"

(Cox, 2021). These numbers show objectively measurable support across the United States for political violence. All of this demonstrates Honoré's point that there is a normative belief in the right to rebel in the United States (1988) and that this view comes from John Locke's views on the right to rebel in the United States.

This study will contribute the literature by providing empirical evidence of how beliefs about the right to connects to support for a specific instance of political violence. To accomplish this, we hypothesize that belief that people are within their right to rebel is connected to their support for the events of January 6th. Past researchers have shown a connection exists between support for political violence and acts of political violence. The acts occur to a lesser extent but, there is a connection that allows us to explain political violence (Carey, 2006; Dyrstad & Hillesund, 2020; Kim, 1966; Gurr, 1970b; Muller, 1972). As a result, we can use this study to gain a better understanding of the political violence that shocked the nation on January 6th.

METHOD

I used an online survey to test the connection between people's support for the insurrection and their beliefs that the rioters were within the right to rebel. The survey was created and conducted on the Qualtrics survey platform. I obtained responses using Amazon Mechanical Turk. As a result, a sample of the American population where $n = 455$ was achieved.

The first step to illustrate the connection between people's support for events on the 6th insurrection and their beliefs that the rioters were within the right to rebel was to measure the support for the riot. Measurement for support for the riot was done in two ways. The first is support, and the second is that the protestors were generally within their rights. These are the dependent variables for this study. To gauge both variables' respondents were shown:

On January 6th, Congress met in a joint session to formalize the results of the 2020 presidential election. The importance of this joint session was due to President Donald Trump, who lost the 2020 presidential election, claiming that there was fraud in the election. He had called for Congress to use this formalization process to overturn the results. To convince Congress to overturn the election, President Trump held a rally where he again said that the election was stolen. After this rally President Trump's supporters breached the Capitol while Congress was in session formalizing the results. The purpose of these protestors/rioters was to overturn the 2020 presidential election in which they believed that Donald Trump defeated Joe Biden.

After reading this, respondents were asked, "Do you support the events that occurred on January 6th?" to determine their support for the riot, the dependent variable. The available options were "Very strongly support", "Not so strongly support", "Neutral", "Not so strongly do not support", "Very strongly do not support", "Don't know", and "Refuse to answer.". These options were a modified scale that Pew Research Center used (2018). The other way the dependent variable was measured was by asking, "Do you view the events that occurred on January 6th as legitimate acts by protestors that were acting within their rights?". The available responses were "Definitely yes", "Probably yes", "Might or might not", "Probably not", "Definitely not", "Don't know", and "Refuse to answer". Responses were based on the available options on Qualtrics's pre-written responses.

To gauge the independent variable, beliefs that the rioters were within the right to rebel, respondents were shown these three quotes:

Please read the following: According to John Locke's Social Contract Theory, humans are born with certain natural rights, some of which are life, liberty, and property. To ensure that these natural rights are to be as secure from tyranny as possible, society gives consent to form a government. Since society is the one giving the power to govern, society can revoke this consent at any time. According to Locke, there are only certain times when society should revoke consent. When society revokes consent, they have triggered the right to rebellion. The right to rebellion allows for society to abolish the government and establish a new one.

After reading this summary of Locke's theory, they saw a specific justification Locke gives:

One of the conditions that allow for the right to rebellion to be triggered, according to Locke, is when a government becomes tyrannical. A government becomes tyrannical when it infringes upon the people's natural rights of life, liberty, and or property. Not every minor infringement of these rights gives rise to the right to rebellion. The abuses of natural rights need to be great mistakes by the government. A series of abuses to the natural rights of its citizens is also something that can make a government be considered tyrannical. When exactly are either of these to be enough for society to invoke the right to rebel? There is no objective way to determine when for either of these conditions, so the people become the judges.

Respondents then saw this second justification for the right to rebel according to Locke:

To pre-engage the electors, the official would have to do some shady stuff to secure their votes. Included in this is bribery, threats, promising a job, promising a policy, or anything else along these lines. The other primary way that officials are improperly elected is if the rules of election are changed. These changes need to be without the consent of the people and against their interests. If society judges that either of these were to occur, society may invoke the right to rebellion.

After each of the justifications, respondents were asked, "Knowing this do you see the events of January 6th protestors acting within their rights?" and had the same available responses as with the scale based on Qualtrics responses. All dependent and independent variables had stronger support corresponding to the high score.

Respondents also had demographic characteristics measured. Education was the first demographic that was measured, with the ordinal responses being based on Qualtrics prewritten responses. The variable was scored so higher levels of education correspond to the high score. The next demographic variable is age, where the options were based upon the Qualtrics prewritten responses. This again had high age corresponding to the high score. Ethnicity was another demographic that was measured, with the available option being based on the work by Toor (2020). The variable was scored as a dummy variable with respondents either being "White/Caucasian" or not. The next demographic that was measured is gender. This was scored as a dummy variable with female being the high score. The final measured demographic is the respondent's political

party. A dummy variable was created, where being “Republican” is the high score. While coding all of the variable response of “Don’t know” or “Refuse to answer” were removed.

RESULTS

In order to explore the connection between support of the events of January 6th and belief in the right to rebel, the collected data is analyzed. The initial analysis begins with a bivariate analysis using all variables. The results are presented in Table 1. Here we see that there is a significant ($p < 0.0000$) connection between respondents' support for the riot and their belief that the rioters were within their right to rebel. The connection is also an extremely strong one, which we see with the result of the Pearson's r test ($r = 0.77$). The extremely strong correlation ($r = 0.78$) continues between respondents' support for the riot and their belief that the protestors were within their right to rebel due to an improperly elected government. This same extremely strong connection between support for the riot, as measured by a general belief that the protestors were within their rights, and the right to rebel based on a tyrannical government and an improperly elected government are also extremely strong with Pearson Correlation Coefficients of 0.83 and 0.80 respectively. From these results, we can see a strong, significant, and positive connection between individuals' support for the riot and their belief that the rioters were within their rights to rebel. Overall, this shows us that those who believe the rioters were within their right to rebel are more likely to support the riot.

Table 1 Bivariate Correlation

	Support for Riot	Generally Within Right	Right to Rebel Due to Tyrannical Government	Right to Rebel Due to Improperly Elected Government
Generally Within Rights	0.8188***			
Right to Rebel Due to Tyrannical Government	0.7718***	0.8300***		
Right to Rebel Due to Improperly Elected Government	0.7797***	0.8005***	0.8183***	
Education	0.1607***	0.1582**	0.1573*	0.1564*
Age	0.0123	0.0007	0.0160	0.0296
Gender	-0.1762**	-0.1927**	-0.1576*	-0.1552
Republican	0.1657**	0.1474**	0.1405*	0.1807**
White	0.1115*	0.1202*	0.1177*	0.0775

Estimated by Stata 17 *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.0000

To see if a demographic characteristic is causing these extremely strong results, we need to look at the results of multiple regression analysis. Table 2 displays the results of this multiple regression analysis. To understand what the results mean, we need to discuss what each model means. Model 1 demonstrates the extremely strong correlation ($\beta=0.81$) between respondents' support of the riot and their belief that the rioters were within their right to rebel due to a tyrannical government while controlling for demographics. We see that the most important and significant ($p<0.01$) variable in the model is the key independent variable, the belief the rioters were within the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government. We also see that demographics have minimal effect, with only gender being significant ($p<0.05$). In Model 2, we see that there is an extremely strong ($\beta=0.84$) and significant ($p<0.01$) connection between respondents' support for the riot and their belief that the protestors were with their right to rebel due to an improperly elected government. The demographic variables were also not important for this model, with only gender being significant ($p<0.05$). Model 2 shows that the belief that the protestors were within their right to rebel due to an improperly elected government is a major part of the support for the riot.

The other way that we measured support is by looking at the generalized belief that the rioters were within their rights. Model 3 demonstrates the relationship between the generalized belief that the protestors were within their rights and the belief that the protestors were within the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government. We can see that the only important variable in this model is the belief that the rioters were within their right to rebel due to a tyrannical government that was strong ($\beta=0.79$), significant ($p<0.01$), and direct connection. This shows that the belief that the protestors were within their right to rebel is a major part of respondents' belief that the protestors were generally within their rights. In Model 4, we see the same pattern where the belief that the rioters were within the right to rebel due to an improperly elected government is strongly ($\beta=0.78$), significantly ($p<0.01$), and directly connected to the belief that the rioters were within their rights as a general sense. The demographic in this model is again not considered to have much effect showing that the belief that the rioters were within their right to rebel is the most important variable.

Table 2 Multiple Regression Analysis

Independent Variables	Model 1 (Support for Riot)	Model 2 (Support for the Riot)	Model 3 (Generalized Belief)	Model 4 (Generalized Belief)
Right to Rebel Due to Tyrannical Government	0.8117**		0.7914**	
Right to Rebel Due to Improperly Elected Government		0.8434**		0.7827**
Education	0.0811	0.0782	0.0491	0.0562
Age	-0.0111	-0.0180	-0.0066	0.0167
Gender	-0.2357*	-0.2339*	-0.1906*	-0.2027*

Republican	-0.2612	0.1746	0.1121	0.0423
White	0.1507	0.1219	0.1123	0.2343**
Cons	0.2888	-0.1502	0.1295	0.1300
Adjusted R ²	0.5960	0.6089	0.6910	0.6474
N	425	428	427	429

Estimated by Stata 17 *p<0.05, **p<0.01

We can see the connection with the bivariate correlation, so we need to look at the usage of multiple regression. Table 2 displays the results of the multiple regression analysis. To understand the results, we need to discuss what each model means. Model 1 is between people's support for the riot, belief that the rioters were within their right to rebel due to a tyrannical government, and demographics. Here we can see that there is a strong ($\beta=0.81$) and significant ($p<0.01$) connection between support for the riot and the belief that the rioters were within the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government. In Model 1, we see that the demographics have minimal effect or were not significant. Model 1 demonstrates that people's belief that the rioters were within their right to rebel due to a tyrannical government is an important part of why people support the riot. In Model 2, we see that there is a strong ($\beta=0.84$), significant ($p<0.01$), and direct connection between people's support for the riot and the belief that the protestors were within their right to rebel due to an improperly elected government. The demographic variables were also not important for this model. Model 2 shows that the belief that the protestors were within their right to rebel due to an improperly elected government is a major part of the support for the riot.

The other way that we measured support is by looking at the generalized belief that the rioters were within their rights. Model 3 demonstrates the relationship between the generalized belief that the protestors were within their rights and the belief that the protestors were within the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government. We can see that the only important variable in this model is the belief that the rioters were within their right to rebel due to a tyrannical government that was extremely strong ($\beta=0.79$) and significant ($p<0.01$). This model shows that the belief that the protestors were within their right to rebel is a major part of respondents' belief that the protestors were generally within their rights. In Model 4, we see the same pattern where the belief that the rioters were within the right to rebel due to an improperly elected government is extremely strongly ($\beta=0.78$) and significantly ($p<0.01$) connected to the belief that the rioters were within their rights as a general sense. The demographic in this model has a relatively weak effect on the dependent variable so, we do not look into them deeply.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Let us start discussing the meaning of the results by looking at the connection between people's support for the riot and their belief that the rioters were within the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government. The exact results are in Tables 1 and 2 with Model 1. Looking at the results, we see a strong connection between support for the riot and the belief that the protestors were

within their right to rebel. Locke framed this right to rebel as resulting from a government infringing upon the natural rights of its citizens. Locke did not intend society to invoke the right but for great issues or a series of mistakes that make the relationship untenable (Locke, 2015). These ideas are a normative part of society from the Declaration of Independence, which lays out the series of abuses that lead to the American Revolution (Jefferson et al., 1776). These ideas are around the part of the normative justification of violence that surrounds the right to rebel. This study's strong results show that the ideas of the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government are an important normative justification for political violence in the United States. The study most directly aids the understanding of the events that occurred on January 6th, but also allows for a deeper glimpse into political violence in the United States. As Gurr describes, the normative justification is only part of the puzzle for when political violence is to occur, they simply act to facilitate the actions after relative deprivation has occurred (1970b). As this piece has previously discussed, the Lockean ideas have become part of American discourse and therefore can be used to help bring the relative deprivation to political violence, but the use of this language is not a sufficient condition to create political violence.

While respondents may not have strictly adhered to what Locke meant, the basic ideas are still there. That is what is important for this relationship. It is not just anger and relative deprivation surrounding the 2020 Presidential election causing support. Since respondents say that protestors are reaching the point that natural rights are under threat. So, we can see there is something deeper going on. The reason why respondents view the results as affecting their natural rights is unknown and needs further study. Without this, we can tell the underlying cause of the relative deprivation is salient to respondents; since they indicated it was bad enough that the protestors were within their right to overthrow the government. This only shows how important understanding these issues are. Even without knowing the ultimate cause, we can still draw conclusions on the importance of these norms. We see that the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government is an important way to explain how some of the relative deprivation resultant from the 2020 Presidential election turned into a historical tragedy. We also can see just how important Locke's ideas are today, with them being a major explanatory variable for why people are supportive of political violence that amounts to an attempted coup. The right to rebel based on a tyrannical government is an important way to look at political violence in the future in the United States.

We know a significant and strong connection exists between support for the riot and the belief that the protestors were within the right to rebel due to an improperly elected government. So, what does this all mean? To fully understand, we need to look at the events that precipitated the storming of the Capitol. The major event was a rally that then-President Donald Trump hosted where he falsely claimed that the election was stolen. His supporters believed this to be true. Supporters went from this rally to the Capitol, which they breached. While inside, they chanted "Stop the Steal" (Leatherby et al., 2021). So, it is clear there is a relationship between beliefs around the validity of the 2020 Presidential and this act of political violence. Another way that stealing could be said is that President Biden was improperly elected. This is a possible justification for the right to rebel, as has been discussed earlier. An interesting aspect of these results is that the connection is between the right to rebel due to an improperly elected government, not just the beliefs of the validity of the 2020 election. This shows just how flawed people see the election, it is so illegitimate that people would be within their right to dissolve the United States government. Showing just how important the beliefs around the election are to those who support the riot. The deep connection to the normative justification is also interesting here. The justifications in the

Declaration of Independence focused on the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government. But the overarching principles are still applicable to other justifications that Locke gives. Coming from the core idea that government comes from the consent of the people. An idea that the Declaration of Independence inputted into American society. So even without specific justifications in the document, the norms created are still important for American society. As can be seen with how closely tied the normative justification that the protestors were within the right to rebel due to an improperly elected government is to support the riot. Why this support matters for the role that the norm plays in society is that the people are the judges for what is sufficient to be able to evoke the right to rebel (Locke, pg. 201). The fact that the people here have acted as the judge in this instance, tells us a lot about the view of the right. The empirical evidence allowed us to see that there was extremely strong support, allows us to understand just how important the norms are in why people are supportive of violence. As a result, we can see the broadness of the normative justification for political violence that the right to rebel is in American society.

Now let us look at the strong connection between the belief that the protestors were within their right to rebel due to a tyrannical government and people's generalized belief that the protestors were within their rights. This result makes intuitive sense that people believing that the protestors are within their rights in a general sense and their belief that they are within their right to rebel would have a strong connection. The generalized belief that the protestors were within their rights is another way to measure respondent's support. So, the same conclusions are drawn here. We find that the idea of the right to rebel is an important normative justification for political violence in the United States. The other part is that this gives us a glance at how deeply tied with other normative justifications the right to rebel is. The connection becomes clear when we look at how close the correlation is. The idea of the right to rebel is a strong predictor for the generalized belief that the protestors are within their rights. This is not perfect, showing that there is more to it than why people believe the protestors are within their rights. This is due to other justifications that would cause people to believe the protestors were within their rights. It is unknown what these may be, which would be subject to future research.

Finally, we need to look at the connection between respondent's beliefs that the protestors were within their right to rebel due to an improperly elected government and their belief that the protestors were generally within their rights. Everything has been discussed in more depth already here. So, the basic conclusion from this connection is as follows. The breadth of the normative justification for the right to rebel comes from the core of Locke's ideas. We again see that the grievances around the legitimacy of the 2020 Presidential election are very important, as seen with the connection to the right to rebel due to an improperly elected government. The normative justifications people hold for the political violence at this event are more than are measured in this study. That is there is more than the belief that the protestors are within the right to rebel due to a tyrannical government. What these are again is unknown, and future research would be required to find out.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Machida for all his help and mentorship during this project. I would also like to thank Dr. Rowling and Ms. Brown for all they did with the SSRP program. I would also like to thank all the other participants and mentors in the SSRP program, they helped

me to expand my thoughts and their comments and questions improved the paper. Finally, I would like to thank the reviewers of this paper.

REFERENCES

- “2018 PEW RESEARCH CENTER’S AMERICAN TRENDS PANEL WAVE 31 JANUARY FINAL TOPLINE January 29 – February 13, 2018.” Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. (February 13, 2018) <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/04/Democracy-topline-for-release.pdf>
- (1776) *Thomas Jefferson, et al, July 4, Copy of Declaration of Independence*. -07-04. [Manuscript/Mixed Material] Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <https://www.loc.gov/item/mtjbib000159/>.
- Buhaug, H., Cederman, L. E., & Gleditsch, K. S. (2014). Square pegs in round holes: Inequalities, grievances, and civil war. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(2), 418-431.
- Cantril, H. (1958). The politics of despair.
- Carey, S. C. (2006). The dynamic relationship between protest and repression. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59(1), 1-11.
- Cohan, J. A. (2005). Necessity, political violence and terrorism. *Stetson L. Rev.*, 35, 903.
- Collier, P., & Hoeffler, A. (2004). Greed and grievance in civil war. *Oxford economic papers*, 56(4), 563-595.
- Corbould, C., & McDonnell, M. (2021, July 7). *Why the alt-right believes another American revolution is coming*. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/why-the-alt-right-believes-another-american-revolution-is-coming-153093>.
- Cox, D. A. (2021, June 3). *After the ballots are Counted: Conspiracies, political violence, and American exceptionalism*. The Survey Center on American Life. <https://www.americansurveycenter.org/research/after-the-ballots-are-counted-conspiracies-political-violence-and-american-exceptionalism/>.
- Cunningham, K. G. (2013). Understanding strategic choice: The determinants of civil war and nonviolent campaign in self-determination disputes. *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(3), 291-304.
- Davies, J. C. (1968). *Towards a Theory of Revolution* [w:] HL Ross. *Perspectives on the Social Order*.
- Della Porta, D. (2008). Research on social movements and political violence. *Qualitative sociology*, 31(3), 221-230.
- Durden, R. F. (1978). The American Revolution as Seen by Southerners in 1861. *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association*, 19(1), 33-42.
- Dyrstad, K., & Hillesund, S. (2020). Explaining support for political violence: grievance and perceived opportunity. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 64(9), 1724-1753.
- Easton, D. (1975). A re-assessment of the concept of political support. *British journal of political science*, 5(4), 435-457.
- Eisinger, P. K. (1973). The conditions of protest behavior in American cities. *American political science review*, 67(1), 11-28.

- Finkel, S. E., Muller, E. N., & Opp, K. D. (1989). Personal influence, collective rationality, and mass political action. *American Political Science Review*, 83(3), 885-903.
- Gurr, T. R. (1970a). Sources of rebellion in Western societies: Some quantitative evidence. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 391(1), 128-144.
- Gurr, T. R. (1970b). *Why men rebel*. Princeton University Press.
- Hennessey-Finske, M. (2021, January 7). 'Second revolution begins': Armed right-wing groups CELEBRATE Capitol attack. Los Angeles Times. <https://www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2021-01-06/the-second-revolution-begins-today-armed-right-wing-groups-celebrate-attack-on-capitol>.
- Honoré, T. (1988). The right to rebel. *Oxford J. Legal Stud.*, 8, 34.
- Jackson, C., & Silverstein, K. (2021, January 6). *PUBLIC POLL FINDINGS AND METHODOLOGY*. IPSOS. https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/news/documents/2021-01/topline_attempted_coup_poll_010621.pdf.
- Locke, J. (2005). Book II Of Civil Government . In *Two treatises of government ; And, a letter Concerning toleration* (pp. 100–202). essay, Digireads.com Pub.
- Morning Consult, & Politico. (2020, October). *National Tracking Poll 2010102 - politico*. Retrieved February 4, 2022, from <https://www.politico.com/f/?id=00000175-48f0-d7aa-af77-5efc0b3b0000>
- Muller, E. N. (1970). Correlates and consequences of beliefs in the legitimacy of regime structures. *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 392-412.
- Muller, E. N. (1972). A test of a partial theory of potential for political violence. *American Political Science Review*, 66(3), 928-959.
- Muller, E. N. (1977). Mass politics: Focus on participation. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 21(1), 63-86.
- Muller, E. N., & Jukam, T. O. (1983). Discontent and aggressive political participation. *British Journal of Political Science*, 13(2), 159-179.
- Ladenburg, T. (2007). *Chapter 12: Hobes, Locke and Jefferson on Revolution and the State of Nature* . Digital History. http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/teachers/lesson_plans/pdfs/unit1_12.pdf.
- Leatherby, L., Ray, A., Singhvi, A., Triebert, C., Watkins, D., & Willis, H. (2021, January 12). *How a presidential rally turned into a capitol rampage*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/01/12/us/capitol-mob-timeline.html>.
- O'Boyle, G. (2002). Theories of justification and political violence: Examples from four groups. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 14(2), 23-46.
- O'Toole, J. W. (2011). *The Right of Revolution: An Analysis of John Locke and Thomas Hobbes' Social Contract Theories* (Doctoral dissertation, Boston College. College of Arts and Sciences).

- Østby, G. (2013). Inequality and political violence: A review of the literature. *International Area Studies Review*, 16(2), 206-231.
- Pines, Y. (2008). To Rebel is Justified? The Image of Zhouxin and the Legitimacy of Rebellion in the Chinese Political Tradition. *Oriens Extremus*, 47, 1-24.
- Tate, T. W. (1965). The Social Contract in America, 1774-1787: Revolutionary Theory as a Conservative Instrument. *The William and Mary Quarterly: A Magazine of Early American History*, 376-391.
- The Visual Journalism Team. (2021, January 7). *Capitol riots: A visual guide to the storming of Congress*. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-55575260>.
- Toor, M. (2020, December 11). *Demographic survey questions that yield valuable insights*. Qualtrics. <https://www.qualtrics.com/blog/demographic-survey-questions/>.
- Van Zomeren, M., Spears, R., Fischer, A. H., & Leach, C. W. (2004). Put your money where your mouth is! Explaining collective action tendencies through group-based anger and group efficacy. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 87(5), 649.
- Wishy, B. (1958). John Locke and the Spirit of '76. *Political Science Quarterly*, 73(3), 413-425.