

This is a very easy way out and a very easy way that you can sign the ballot for the negative.

So at the end of the day, it becomes clear that I am winning the round. I am not only proving that violent revolution is unnecessary, I am also proving to you that the affirmative case doesn't affirm. And even if it did affirm, I'm meeting it better than she does. So now you have all the reasons you need to negate the resolution. Thank you.

## **FINAL AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL: TAARINI VOHRA, HOCKADAY SCHOOL**

Let's go to the negative criterion. The problem is that he's still fundamentally mishandling my main argument about necessity and justice. He keeps saying that I don't have a warrant. The problem is that the warrant is very clear. If something is needed, is a necessity of justice, is a part of the process of getting to justice, then it is something people are due, and thus it is just. That is not circular. That is saying that in the process of getting to justice, if there is a step in that process that is just. What that means is that if a violent revolution is a step in terms of getting to justice, it is a fundamental right, and it preserves human dignity because it is a fundamental right, then it is just. He is never responding to that argument.

In terms of his criterion, remember that he is saying preventing unnecessary suffering is just, meaning that the converse would be true: preventing necessary suffering would be unjust. That means either if necessity has nothing to do with justice, his criterion is not linked to justice, so none of the negative case matters, or, that there is an intrinsic connection between necessity and justice as I have discussed. So, what that means is that ... and finally remember I told you that the only reason we care about preventing unnecessary suffering is because of a conception of human dignity. That means you are going to be looking at the affirmative criterion.

Also, my opponent has never addressed the fact that a fundamental part of preserving human dignity is respecting individuals' fundamental rights. So if I show that violent revolution is a fundamental right, then it is something that the people are due, and thus it is just.

That being said, now let's go to the definition of political oppression. He keeps articulating that I'm not showing what "on balance" political oppression is. But as the Rummel analysis states, in 218 regimes worldwide, political oppression is something which is arbitrary, has no checks, and that people are killed. That is very clearly "on balance" what political oppression is. His argument of Florida is not the norm; it is the exception. It should not be considered in terms of what "on balance" is.