

every single argument on her side of the flow, you're still going to vote negative because she's not proving the burden of the resolution. She's proving to you that violent revolution is permissible in certain situations, not that it's justified. Additionally, you can look to her definition of political oppression. There is a problem. While there are definitely severe cases of political oppression, my opponent fails to take into account the totality of the resolution. For example, in the year 2000 in Florida, some people were not allowed to vote. That was political oppression, but it clearly was not harsh enough to call on the citizenry to pick up weapons and dismantle the government. There are clearly nonviolent methods, so you ought to err on the side of caution and vote negative because at least that way we don't allow violence to be a tool in the arsenal of a revolutionary.

Then you can look to the argument that she makes in the second contention, and this is very important. She says that the threat of violence is tantamount to violent revolution. This doesn't make sense because if the framers of the resolution wanted to talk about the threat of violent revolution, then they would have inserted the word "threat." So I would argue that the threat of violent resolution is not a way that you can affirm the resolution. Additionally, the threat of violent revolution exists when you vote negative as well. We classify it as unjust, but people can still threaten the government with violent revolution. Now you can look to her standard. There are a few problems with her standard. The first problem is that she's telling you that we're only looking at whether or not violent revolution as an idea is justifiable. But if we know that violent revolution is going to produce harms, then we wouldn't say it's justifiable. We know the history of violent revolution. We know that it harms innocents and it is generally unsuccessful. Given this knowledge we can't say that violent revolutionaries are idealistically charging in and all innocent deaths are incidental. By knowingly engaging in acts that produce undesirable results, the revolutionaries intend to do harm.

Additionally, she contradicts herself, and this is very important. She says in her criterion that we need to respect human dignity, but violent revolution necessarily requires violating human dignity in the long run (oh sorry) in the short run, to have long-term benefits. For example, we're going to have to hurt innocent people to have some benefits at the end of the day. Moreover, this criterion is ends based. She has the burden of proving that violent revolution can actually succeed; otherwise, you never know whether or not she is respecting human dignity.

First, the use of violence, especially by ideological revolutionaries, tends to produce what is euphemistically referred to as collateral damage. This is the argument I made earlier. Insofar as violent revolutionaries have this idea that the ends justify the means, they are allowed to violate innocents' rights.

Second, violent revolution tends overwhelmingly to produce undemocratic and oppressive regimes. The problem with violent revolutions is that the revolutionaries do