

Vohra continued developing her case by directly announcing a core value and a criterion for weighing that value:

- The ultimate value: “I value justice as it is the ultimate good implied by the resolution. While there are different conceptions of justice, all are centrally based on the notion of fairness, in that people should be treated as their actions merit. So justice is defined as giving each their due.”
- The value criterion: “The criterion is respecting human dignity, which is the innate worth that separates people from objects. Dignity makes justice meaningful because only beings with worth are due something.”

The remainder of the affirmative case is structured in key contentions and subpoints. Vohra offered the following contentions, each of which was supported with authoritative quotations and examples:

- I. People have an inherent right to violently rebel.
 - a. An oppressive government has lost the authority to demand allegiance.
 - b. The right to violently rebel is justified as a form of self-defense.
- II. Any revolution to restore rights will include violence.

The final element of the affirmative case is the conclusion. A good conclusion should provide a brief summary and create a sense of finality. Vohra concluded her speech with the following two sentences: “The only potential for justice is to allow citizens their fundamental right to violently revolt. Thus, I urge an affirmative ballot, and now stand ready for cross-examination.”

FURTHER READING

Hanes, T. Russell, and Scott Devoid. “Toward a New LD Paradigm.” *The Rostrum*, October 2006. www.nflonline.org/uploads/Rostrum/1006_047_050.pdf.

Luong, Minh A. “Burden of Proof and Presumption in Lincoln-Douglas Debate: A Call for Reform.” *The Rostrum*, November 1995. www.nflonline.org/uploads/Rostrum/debate1195luong.pdf.