

worry that a crackdown would undermine their liberal ideology. On balance, this is simply not true of oppressive regimes. Even political philosopher Hannah Arendt, who is an advocate of nonviolence, admits this failure and states: “If Gandhi had met with a different enemy—Stalin’s Russia, [or] Hitler’s Germany, instead of England—the outcome would not have been decolonization, but massacre and submission. England had good reasons for restraint as they enjoyed domestically the blessings of constitutional government.” A negation guarantees perpetual violations of human dignity since the oppressed people have no pure avenue for change. 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.

FIRST CROSS-EXAMINATION PERIOD: CROSS-EXAMINATION OF TAARINI VOHRA (HOCKADAY SCHOOL) BY BILAL MALIK (JAMES LOGAN HIGH SCHOOL).

Q: Let’s imagine for a moment that I’m being mugged, OK?

A: OK.

Q: Do you think it’s just for me to retaliate against my aggressor?

A: I would say that that is a right of self-defense.

Q: So it is just?

A: That would be just.

Q: OK, now would it be just for me to subdue my attacker, tie him up, and proceed to beat him with a baseball bat?

A: The question you seem to be asking ... the answer is a little more complicated.

Q: Sure, go ahead.

A: OK, when somebody attacks you, every individual has that fundamental right to self-defense. So what that means is that in a question of justice and what people are due, that right is something that matters, no matter how you implement that right.

Q: OK, but isn’t there some sort of proportionality to self-defense? Like if you steal a dollar from me, am I justified in breaking your kneecaps?

A: Well, my argument is that when an oppressive government uses violence against ...

Q: No, no, no. I’m just asking you a question outside of the scope of the resolution. Is there proportionality with self-defense?

A: The individual is allowed to use violence in response to the oppressor.

Q: So if I take a dollar from you right now, can you beat me?

A: The problem with your analysis is ... no, I wouldn’t be able to beat you.

Q: Why not?

A: The situation you are drawing is not similar to the situation of an oppressive regime.