

can sign the ballot right now because she is not providing you with an adequate response as to why there is not a difference between permissibility and justice.

Then you can look to the response I made against political oppression. She says that my example I agreed to is not the norm. But that was the point. There is no reason to believe why her example, or her analysis of political oppression, always being violent is true. We ought to err on the side of caution because voting negative doesn't mean that violence cannot be used. It just means that we are not going to allow revolutionaries to have the blank check of violence in their arsenal. Rather, we ought to look at specific scenarios and then affirm the resolution. Violence hurts innocent people. It's a very important issue. We shouldn't treat it delicately. Insofar as voting affirmative means that sometimes we would be justifying violence when it is not needed, you ought to vote negative. This was not adequately refuted, so you have a third voting issue for the negative side.

Then you can go to her criterion of respecting human dignity. She says that the example she gave in cross-examination and the way I answered the question means that all the responses don't matter. She's wrong, because in the example she tells you that the lifeguard is trying to save the life of the child. The problem, however, is that he doesn't know that he is going to fail. Violent revolutionaries do know that they are going to fail because violent revolutions don't succeed. Remember this is explained by the Ackerman and Duvall analysis that explains that the military prowess of the state is much stronger than that of the revolutionaries. She is never refuting this analysis. So if I know that a certain action would require me to trample over the rights of innocents and I also know that I'm going to be unsuccessful, how can I ever say that it's justified for me to partake in that action?

Additionally, I would argue that she's not refuting the analysis that violent revolution tends overwhelmingly to produce undemocratic regimes. Remember that the problem with violent revolutions is that the revolutionaries do not put down their guns. She gave you the example of the United States being an effective revolution. But that's not the case. After the American revolution, only people that owned property, that were white, that had blond hair and blue eyes were allowed to vote. Blacks were enslaved, women were not allowed to vote, until nonviolent methods were used. Which means that you need the negative side to have any sort of political change.

So, she has the burden of proving that violent revolutions are actually effective, otherwise she's not going to be protecting rights. Additionally, remember I told you she is contradicting herself and this is something she is never refuting. This is another easy place to sign the ballot for the negative. Insofar as she is saying we should respect human dignity and insofar as violent revolution requires us to trample over human dignity, there is no way that she can win the round. She is never refuting this analysis.