

lifeguard were to try and save a life and may fail in saving that life, the action of trying to save that life was still unjust? Meaning that the end consequences of an action are not what determines the justness of an action, but rather the action in and of itself. So he's defeated his own arguments to my criterion with his concession in cross-examination. All of his other arguments talk about how violent revolution violates human dignity in the short term and that violent revolution doesn't actually succeed. But remember I don't have to show you whether it succeeds or not, simply whether or not violent revolution is a fundamental right.

So this is where you are going to come to Subpoint B, which is conceded completely. Remember that Rummel says that politically oppressive regimes use violence against their people and kill their own citizens. Which means that every individual who has the right to self-defense, which is a fundamental right, is transferred to the collective body of citizens as a right to self-defense against an oppressive regime. Meaning that it is just for individuals to protect themselves using a violent revolution.

But then we can go to the negative case itself. There are a couple of problems with it, most of which are responded to by the second contention of the affirmative case which he mishandles badly. He only makes two answers: one that it doesn't make sense if we are talking about the threat of violence. But remember that the threat of violence only matters because violence itself will be used ultimately. And second, that we can still use the threat of violence in the negative world. In the negative world, because he is saying he is preventing unnecessary suffering through nonviolence, at the point where nonviolence is only effective through the use of violence, then it is just through a violent revolution, which is specifically what my second contention outlines. But both in terms of Gandhi and Martin Luther King, the only reason they were successful is because of violent revolution. His own analysis explains in the Orange Revolution that that was within a democratic regime which on balance is not an oppressive government and that nonviolence was only pivotal. It was not the only thing that allowed the revolution to be successful. Thus, I affirm.

REBUTTAL SPEECH BY BILAL MALIK, JAMES LOGAN HIGH SCHOOL

The order is going to be the negative case and then the affirmative case.

Taarini is very persuasive, but don't let her eloquence cloud your judgment. She's completely mishandling the negative case. To the criterion "prevention of unnecessary suffering," she explains that there is a clear link to justice. If something is unnecessary it's unjust, which means that if it's necessary it has to be justified. That's not true. Justice is not a binary. If something is unnecessary, the other thing doesn't necessarily