

have to be necessary. Remember, I provided a lot of analysis against this. I told you against the affirmative case, that we know that killing is unjust. We never say that killing is just. Rather, in certain situations we say that killing is permissible. Her response to this argument was that if it's necessary it is just, because it's necessary. If you pay attention to her argument, it is very circular. It says that the warrant for the claim is the claim itself. There is no reason to believe why necessity has to equal justice. I'm telling you that necessity means that it's permissible. We would never say that it's justified to kill people. Rather, it's permissible to kill people in certain situations.

Then she says that I don't explain what unnecessary means. In the context of the resolution, I explain that a violent revolution is unnecessary because it creates harms that don't need to be there, then that means it is unnecessary and as a result, it is unjust. So I do explain the unnecessary factor.

So let's go to the first contention. Her responses are wholly unresponsive. The first contention explains that the reason why nonviolence works is because it increases the popularity of the revolution. This, A) gives the revolutionaries the moral high ground and B) allows the revolutionaries to co-opt the military, which is a benefit that can only be captured by the negative ballot. This is explained through the analysis that I provided about Ukraine. In Ukraine they were having a peaceful revolution. Soldiers noticed the peaceful revolution and instead of shooting the revolutionaries, they joined their movement. Which means that we can co-opt the military through nonviolence. So not only does it reach the same ends, but it is also more beneficial because it allows us to invert the government from the inside.

Then go to the second point I make. I tell you that sympathy forces people to focus on the message and not the action. This is not responded to at all. I explained that oppressive governments are seen to be all the more oppressive when governments are attacking a vulnerable people. This means that the sympathy is on the side of the revolutionaries.

Also, remember the Ackerman and Duvall analysis that she is never refuting. Fifty of the 67 transitions were nonviolent in the past 35 years, which means that nonviolence is an alternative. So here's how you are going to sign your ballot. You are going to realize that while violence might work, it is not necessary because we have nonviolent methods. On balance, 50 out of 67 transitions were nonviolent. So you already have an empirical warrant as to why you are going to vote negative. Do not let her make new responses; do not let her elaborate as this is my last speech.

Now let's move on to the affirmative case. The next easiest place to vote negative is based off of this idea of permissibility. Remember, her only warrant as to why necessity equals "just" is because it is necessary. That is very circular. There is no warrant that she provides to you. I'm providing you with an example and I tell you that insofar as killing is always unjust, we would say that killing is permissible in self-defense. You