

not put down their guns. While violent revolution may be an expedient means of removing the government from power, it also establishes a culture in society in which extra-political methods are an adequate means of creating social change.

Finally, Peter Ackerman and Jack Duvall explain that because of the nature of the state, violent revolution is unlikely to succeed: “In a contest of violence against violence, the superiority of the government has always been absolute. People who choose guns and bombs as the way to rise up will find that the regimes they attack have far more experience in such contests.” This means that at the end of the day, violent revolution will not be successful, so she won’t be protecting human rights.

Then you can look to her first contention. While she is talking about the social contract, she forgets that the social contract doesn’t allow for the innocents and their rights to be trampled upon. Revolution is justified, but violent revolution is not. We can always prefer nonviolence, so you always prefer the negative.

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

Q: Ready?

A: Uh huh.

Q: So against the affirmative case you talk about Florida as an example of political oppression. And you agree that the resolution is a question of on-balance, general principles, right?

A: I understand that you are going to make the argument that this is one example. My argument, however, is that nowhere in the affirmative case do you prove that political oppression always or on balance has to be violent.

Q: OK, but just answer my question, please. So, would you say that Florida is the norm for political oppression?

A: No, but I also would say that the political oppression ...

Q: So it’s not the norm for political oppression?

A: Can I answer the question?

Q: Sure.

A: OK, I would say that the examples of political oppression that you cite in the case are not the norm for political oppression. So, likewise, if you’re going to reject my example of what political oppression is, we ought to reject yours as well, because it’s also one-sided.

Q: OK. Now let’s go to the negative case. You talk about the idea that if there is unnecessary suffering involved, that’s unjust.