

A: I don't know what the necessary conditions are. My argument is that you're not meeting the condition that if you're creating unnecessary suffering, it is unjustified. I have to negate the resolution.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL SPEECH BY TAARINI VOHRA (HOCKADAY SCHOOL)

Let's go to the negative criterion. His criterion is the prevention of unnecessary suffering. And as we discussed in cross-examination, it has a clear link to justice, which means that if he's preventing necessary suffering, that would be unjust. When he uses his own words "necessary" and "unnecessary" within in his criterion, he himself is establishing a link between what would be necessary suffering and justice. However, my opponent fails to draw a distinction in how we determine what is necessary suffering. In the affirmative case, since we both agree that justice is defined as giving each their due, if human dignity and preserving human dignity is a necessity in terms of achieving justice, then it is just. But he also fundamentally mishandles the affirmative criterion when he fails to explain that if violent revolution is a fundamental right, then it respects individuals' dignity, and thus it is a due thing to the people. He has fundamentally mishandled that.

So, the reason you care about preventing unnecessary suffering is due to a conception of human dignity, and the way we protect human dignity is through the protection of fundamental rights.

So then you can go to the affirmative case. First of all, he says that I only explain why it is justified and not necessary. The problem is that if it is necessary in order to achieve justice, it is a part of justice and thus is just.

So then we can go to observation two, which is the part where we talk about what political oppression is. He says that I am not encompassing for the totality of the resolution. The problem is in cross-examination he tells me that his example of Florida is not the norm of what political oppression is. Rather I would say that political oppression is where people have no political rights so it is both arbitrary and has no checks.

But when you get to Contention One, Subpoint B, I give you analysis by Rummel that says 218 regimes worldwide say that political oppression is killing of its citizens, which is clearly "on balance," meaning that political oppression is violence against its own people. So, what that means is that back up into the criterion, if I respect human dignity by showing that violent revolution is a fundamental right, then it is just. He only makes a few answers to it, two of which say that if violent revolution produces harms and it harms innocents then it's unjust. But in cross-examination, I asked him if a