

attempt as much as is humanly possible to refrain from bringing about unnecessary suffering. Thus, the value criterion for justice is the prevention of unnecessary suffering. It is the thesis and sole contention of the negative that violent revolutions produce unnecessary suffering because of the existence of nonviolent alternatives. First, nonviolent change increases the power and popularity of the revolution. Refraining from violence grants the revolutionaries the moral high ground, which aids in recruiting additional revolutionaries. This allows nonviolent revolutionaries to co-opt the vast power of the military. Ultimately, soldiers are just people and when they are shot at, their natural inclination is to shoot back. But historically, nonviolent movements have posed the military with a moral dilemma that often helps the nonviolent revolution. For example, in the recent Ukrainian revolution, soldiers were sent to break up a massive nonviolent protest. However, the soldiers were persuaded by the revolutionary's motives and tactics and promptly joined what became known as the Orange Revolution, which successfully overthrew an illegitimately elected leader. Violent revolution, on the other hand, escalates the violence of the state by giving it grounds to argue that its violence is meant to prevent chaos and safeguard the peace.

Second, by engendering sympathy amongst the general population and the oppressors, revolutionaries force everyone to focus on the message rather than the act of violence itself. The oppressive government is seen to be all the more oppressive for its use of violence against the nonviolent. And indeed, in recent history, the vast majority of successful rebellions have been nonviolent. Peter Ackerman and Jack Duvall, writing for the International Center for Nonviolent Conflict, explain that "in 50 of 67 transitions from authoritarianism in the past 35 years, according to a recent study by Freedom House, it was not violent rebellion but nonviolent civic resistance that was the pivotal force." Nonviolence, with its dedication to reason and democracy, is the only method of rebellion which can ever hope to establish a just state based on democratic ideals. The implication of the negative case is twofold. First, even if you believe that my opponent's criterion is the weighing mechanism in the round, I meet it better because I provide that end without looking to unnecessary suffering. Additionally, you can vote negative based solely on the negative case. I'm not [just] providing an alternative. I'm providing an alternative that doesn't have to harm people. If we can choose between violence and nonviolence, we always have to choose the latter. Otherwise, we are going to be harming the rights of innocent people.

Now let's move on to the affirmative case. There's something really important to understand about the affirmative case. She's talking to you about how violent revolution can be necessary, but that doesn't explain why it's justified. For example, we can agree that sometimes killing is necessary, but we always say that killing is not justified. In self-defense it might be necessary, so the conclusion, then, is that killing is permissible. In the same way, violent revolution is permissible. So even if my opponent is winning