

Dilemma of lethal and non-lethal force

To protect our forces against hostile attacks from small attacks ranging from small protest crowds to major riots

Either

We refrain from retaliating against the source groups, retreat, and give up the streets

because
our forces are not sufficient to control the attacks

in which case

- 1) attackers will feel victorious
- 2) attackers will be emboldened to attack additional targets, including mounting a revolution
- 3) our forces will feel dispirited

Or

We use as much lethal force (including firing on the crowds)

because
if we don't stand our ground we will appear weak and vulnerable to any kind of mob attack

in which case

- 1) we are perceived as over-reacting and using force unjustly
- 2) our allies will begin to desert us (by not supporting our actions)
- 3) we would increasingly have to act alone internationally to protect our interests, safety, and trade

Or

We use as significant non-lethal force

because
we have to protector ourselves against mob attack

in which case

- 1) we are perceived as using appropriate level of force to protect public order...IF we otherwise act in a just fashion
- 2) we may be attacked by lethal force exactly because we didn't use lethal force

in which case this will

weaken our security and weaken our internal freedoms hence change the nature of our society

weaken our security in the long run making us more of a fortress state

stabilize our security in the short run but perhaps embolden attackers in the long run