

Theory File

Chapter 1: introduction	5
Fairness is important	5
Frontlines to fairness.....	6
Fairness > Education.....	9
Education is important	11
Education > Fairness.....	12
Competing interpretations > Reasonability.....	14
Reasonability > Competing Interpretations	15
Drop the debater, not the argument.....	16
Drop the argument, not the debater	18
A2 Meaningful Message	21
Theory is an RVI	22
RV Bad Preempts	23
Theory is not an RVI.....	24
Chapter 2: Topicality	25
aff must be topical	25
Reasonability for topicality	28
Extra-topicality Bad	29
Extra-topicality good.....	29
Aff flexibility good.....	32
aff flexibility Bad	33
Framer's Intent Good	34
Framer's Intent Bad.....	35
Under-limiting bad	37
Over-limiting bad	38
Precision Good	39
Precision Bad	40
Field Context Good	41
Field Context Bad.....	42
FX-T Bad.....	43
Fx T Good	45
Legal Definitions Bad.....	47

Legal Definitions Good	48
Contextual Definitions Bad	48
Contextual Definitions Good	49
Dictionary definitions good	50
dictionary definitions bad	51
Bidirectionality good	52
Bidirectionality bad	53
Common usage good	55
Common usage bad	56
Grammar good	57
Grammar bad	58
Chapter 3: Scope	60
plan focus > Res focus	60
Plan focus good frontlines.....	62
RESOLUTION IS A TOPIC AREA.....	65
Res Focus > Plan Focus.....	66
Topical counterplans bad	67
Topical counterplans good.....	68
Pics bad.....	69
PICs Good	70
Chapter 4: Status	71
conditionality bad	71
conditionality good	71
dispositionality bad	74
Dispositionality Good	75
Limited Conditionality Bad	76
limited conditionality good	77
Chapter 5: Counterplans and fiat	79
Negative Fiat Good	79
ALTERNATIVE AGENT FIAT BAD	81
Alternative Agent Fiat GOOD	84
Multi-actor fiat bad	86
Multi-actor fiat good	89
International Fiat bad	91
International fiat Good	93

Private actor fiat bad	94
Private actor Fiat good.....	96
PCCS Bad (Consult).....	97
PCCS Bad (Delay)	98
PCCS Bad (Condition).....	99
PCCS Good (General).....	100
Word pics bad.....	101
Word pics good	102
Textual > Mechanical Competition	104
Mechanical > Textual Competition	105
Chapter 6: Kritik Alternatives	106
Non-existent Alts Bad.....	106
Rejection is not an alternative.....	107
Policymaking > kritik framework	109
Non-implementable K Alts Bad	111
non-textual alts bad.....	113
Non-Specified Actor Bad	114
Res K's Bad.....	115
Chapter 7: Permutations	116
Permutations Need a Text	116
Perm is an advocacy.....	117
Perm is a test of competition	118
Severance permutations bad	119
SEVERANCE PERMutationS GOOD.....	120
Intrinsicness Permutations Bad	121
Intrinsicness permutations good	122
Time Frame Permutations Bad.....	123
Time Frame Permutations Good	124
Chapter 8: Burdens	125
Single NIB Bad	125
Single nib good.....	126
Multiple nibs bad.....	127
Impact-exclusive standards Bad	129
Chapter 9: paradigms	132
Tabula rasa good	132

Tabula Rasa Bad	133
offense-defense > truth-testing	135
PolicyMaking > Truth-testing	136
Best justification > truth-testing	137
Offense-Defense > Policy Making	139
Best Justification > Policy Making	140
Truth Testing > Policy Making	141
Truth-testing > Offense-defense.....	142
Best Justification > Offense-defense	143
policy making > best justification	144
offense-defense > best justification	145
Aff framework choice good cards	146
Comparative worlds good.....	150
truth testing bad cards	152
Policymaking good cards	154
policymaking bad cards	157
***Chapter 10: Miscellaneous	160
Citing Without Permission bad.....	160
Miscut evidence bad	162
Full cites necessary	163
Ellipses bad	164
Switch-sides debate good	165
Narratives bad	167
Negatively worded interpretations bad	168
Arbitrary counter-interp planks bad	169
Non-shell theory bad	171

Chapter 1: introduction

Fairness is important

1) When debate's rules are unfairly skewed, the activity becomes more risky while the payoff remains the same. We participate after making an assessment of the risks of debating, such as the requisite large amounts of preparation and time commitments, measured against potential benefits like wins and trophies. An unfair advantage for one side destroys this calculation's viability, dissuading debaters from remaining in debate. If risk calculations assume that we have an equal chance of winning on either side, but in reality we do not, there is a disincentive to participate.

People leaving debate is bad because:

A) Debate provides for educational benefits such as giving students the communication skills they need to succeed later in life, helping individuals and entire communities.

B) We obviously care about debate because we're here. Therefore, we have an incentive to discourage actions that would destroy the community the activity is based upon.

2) You are obligated to give people their due. All humans have an intrinsic right to be treated fairly, as we interact with others in a moral community in which fairness provides a foundation for our relationships with other people. Even though we are debating, we are still humans, so we still have obligations to treat one another fairly.

3) It's a gateway issue- A skew in fairness makes impartiality impossible. Fairness is necessary to determine the winner because you are asked to determine who is the better debater, not who is the better cheater. Both opponents need equal opportunity to present their own arguments and contest each others' arguments, or the basis for determining the better side is fundamentally skewed.

4) If you care about debate, then you should care about fairness. The basic premises of debate assume that the best debater should win the round. When the round is unfairly skewed toward one side, the fundamental aim of debate can never be achieved.

5) Because debate also has educational value, unfairness in rounds would hinder the education of debaters treated unfairly. Debate wouldn't be educational if it was unfair – ie, if negs had a very small burden of proof, debate would be uneducational because neg research would be unnecessary and affs would do no work because they could never win. The competitive equity of the activity gives us the ability to have educational discussion, so fairness is necessarily linked to education.

Frontlines to fairness

A2 Time Skew for the person who ran theory

No Impact – Time skew has no impact because you have to allocate time to answer any argument. Voting me down for “forcing” them to run theory justifies voting me down because they had to read a block against my argument.

Mutual – The time skew is mutual. I have to invest time in running theory OR by going for one of my arguments. This means I also have an opportunity cost because I can no longer go for a different argument.

A2: Fairness leads to intervention

Only under a **reasonability** model of fairness does fairness lead to intervention, competing interpretations hold that debaters should advance their own conception of what it means to be fair, so this argument would support competing interpretations rather than refute fairness. Competing interps checks back fairness because debaters advocate what it means to be fair, so it is an issue that is resolved in the round.

Calling intervention bad **concedes the internal link to fairness**, as intervention is only a bad thing if it unfairly advantages one debater. This means that we both link to fairness, so fairness is a relevant consideration.

There is **always intervention** as a judge has biases and arguments can never be fully fleshed out in a timed round.

Theory shells and fairness **reduce substantive judge intervention** by making a clear standards and having them vote on who is winning the theory debate rather than arbitrarily discrediting a position because they feel its bad.

Judge intervention with fairness is good because as an evaluator **you have an obligation to ensure a fair debate** and set norms that some arguments screw our activity too much.

A2: Fairness has no brightline

Under the competing interpretations, a bright line is **not required**. Competing interpretations leads the debaters to promote their interpretation of fairness. A bright line is not required as to determine who gets the ballot but rather who promotes fairness more.

Furthermore, I even specifically give you the bright line. The bright line for fairness can be **established by the theory standards** which measure the fairness and unfairness of certain arguments.

Even if the bright line is vague, there are **still some standard of fairness that everyone agrees are true**. For example, me punching you and ripping up your flow is considered to be unfair regardless who you ask. What you’re doing has clearly passed the threshold of fairness, that it doesn’t even matter if the threshold is vague.

A2: You could've been unfair back

This argument is terrible for debate considering it just **encourages further abuse** to the point where debate has no more competitive value and it is no longer a test of debating skill but of who is the better cheater, defeating debate's purpose

Just because you punched me **doesn't mean I should punch you back**. If what you're doing is bad, I shouldn't stoop to your level. Just because I can be unfair doesn't mean I should. I'm trying to make debate better.

Fairness is unique. My response would abuse you in some other way, preventing an equal playing field even if I responding unfairly. Me being unfair back doesn't translate to me having an equal chance to win.

My opponent is just **trying to theory bait me**. S/he is essentially saying "Why don't you run something I can run theory on?" and should be rejected on face. S/he is trying to make me become abusive so that he/she can run/turn the theory on me.

A2: Theory is an ex-post facto

This is **not an ex post facto rule**. Debaters run standards like _____ all the time in theory debates and win rounds off of these arguments. If each of these arguments ostensibly establishes a rule for how debate should be carried out in the future, then the rule has already been established. It's your job to investigate if you're unfair, as running an argument is a choice and shows that you've thought about it. As long as your rational, it's your burden to be able to **think about and defend your practices**, that's what comes with being able to think.

Theory is the **only way to check back abuse** and make a change in what arguments are common, since it actively punishes transgressions. Even if this were the first theory argument being run of this sort, it is necessary to initiate some sort of theoretical objection to the argument.

Ex post facto rules are **only unfair if they are not contestable**. Given that she has the opportunity to debate the rule that would take effect this round, the concept of "ex post facto" does not carry the same weight that it does in legal cases.

At the very least, **drop the argument**. Accepting an "ex post facto" rule is similar to accepting any other kind of response that proves why you may not vote for a given argument. You should drop the debater for the other reasons expressed in the shell and my previous responses, but err on the side of dropping the argument even if you accept this argument about ex post facto rules.

Given the structure of a debate round and infinite amounts of potential , it is **impossible to establish all of the rules** for the debate before the round, and thus, some rules must be ex-post facto

Furthermore, allowing debaters to determine for themselves what constitutes the fairest and most educational debate **promotes critical thinking** and argumentative skill, rather than simply forcing debaters to conform to external rules

A2: Theory is unfair

At the very least, my theory is **comparatively more fair** than substance you're running.

Furthermore, theory provides a **check against** team **resource** and size **gaps** – it's a lot easier for a massive school like Greenhill or Glenbrooks to write new positions as opposed to a smaller

school, but the fundamentals of theory doesn't change. Even if my school is bigger than his/her's, that checks back my advantage.

This argument **makes an appeal to fairness** so it concedes the internal link that fairness is intrinsically valuable. What constitutes fair argumentation requires theory standards to establish, showing why the argument is self-contradictory.

I was forced to run theory or I would have been screwed over. Even if I'm responding with something unfair that's not my fault because they made me do it.

Fairness > Education

1) **Education requires fairness** to prevent all the knowledge from just becoming arbitrary knowledge- any education-related standards they have are linked specifically into topic-specific education. For this sort of education to happen, we have to have a framework of fairness existing such that we know what is topic-specific and what is just arbitrary.

2) They may win that the overall quantity of education may increase, however, **quality is determined by fairness**. We need to have a framework of fairness to guide the in-depth research required for good debates- in other words, fairness is key to making sure that research creates an in-depth debate that our education applies to and is used.

Thus, even if they win that education is more important, I'll win that fairness is the **key internal link** to any benefits from education.

3) Fairness is more important than education because what constitutes **structural fairness is much more objective** than what promotes education, so it is much easier to evaluate the theoretical legitimacy based on its fairness than its education.

4) **Education is a subjective** standard. The judge can evaluate how easy it is for each debater to win the round, and yet any standard of education is based upon a subjective idea of what is important to know about, and different judges have educations in differing fields making them biased to what is educationally important. Also, theory standards help us determine what fairness means, but they can't help us determine what is educational. Preferring fairness prevents intervention and for you to vote on something you need to know exactly what you're voting on.

5) **Debate is distinct** from other academic pursuits because of its competitive nature. Instead of just doing research on potential topics in a friendly setting, we choose to engage in a more adversarial activity in which we have the opportunity to be evaluated and win recognition. The educational benefit of debate stems from its adversarial nature and the critical thinking it creates. These are best preserved through fairness because it ensures that both sides can engage in the discussion.

6) **We have a fundamental moral obligation** to treat others fairly, while we do not have a moral obligation to constantly educate and be educated. Even though we are debaters, we are still humans, so we should still treat others fairly. Fairness links to the fundamental basis of our relationships with others.

7) There are an infinite number of educational arguments that can be made, but **not all educational arguments are fair**. When we foster a system in which people can make countless unfair arguments as long as they are educational, people no longer engage in the substance of the arguments and can only ever turn to theory. If my opponent wants to further education, then he/she must accept that fairness precludes education for this reason.

8) Empirically we care about fairness more than education. We go for strategies that will help us win more but we don't necessarily always go for the most educational arguments. For example,

theory is not the most educational argument because it doesn't teach us about the topic, but debaters go for it because it allows them a better chance to win the round. What debaters care about is most consistent with the true goal of debate because it reveals why people do debate in the first place. **This link turns their participation argument.**

Education is important

1. Education is valuable because it helps us succeed in life and makes society better as a whole by increasing society's ability to function. The impacts garnered from education are lasting, and impact our real lives, as well as the lives of those around us.
2. Education is the primary goal of debate: the skills that debate measures – like critical thinking and research skills – are educational, meaning that it is undeniable that debate has an educational element.
3. You as a judge have the duty to vote on education.

/Doug Sigel. [Former debate coach and professor at Northwestern University]. “The Punishment Theory: Illegitimate Styles and Theories as Voting Issues.” 1984/

A second reason for punishment sees the judge as an educator. Teams damaging the goals of the debate activity should lose because the judge has a duty to improve the debate form--independent of the duty he has to render a decision on the issues surrounding the plan. The medium in debate is the message: to abuse the medium is to destroy the message. A teacher, for example, would not accept a paper with good ideas that are presented in an unscholarly fashion-in disorganized, ungrammatical style replete with spelling errors and devoid of organization. While it stretches the analogy to suggest that judges should be solely concerned with skills, it is reasonable for the judge to punish teams violating the criteria presented in the round to determine the better job of debating.

Education > Fairness

1. Education is the **ultimate aim of debate**: The point of debate is to educate debaters on global issues, how to research, critical thinking – not how to be fair. Otherwise, topics would be about issues like multiple a prioris or time skew rather than real-world political issues.

2. **Fairness is subjective**, different people have different ideas as to what arguments and practices are fair so we can never know when fairness is being achieved. Further, people have different conceptions of what it means to be fair. For instance, we don't know if fairness is procedural or if it is substantive, ie if fairness means correcting the neg win skew or not.

3. **Unfairness is non-unique** because there's always some aspect of an interpretation that isn't as a good as another.

4. Education is something we take away from debate: It is impossible to take fairness away from debate because we never know what it truly is and how to apply it; whereas, **education** is something that **can be applied** in any situation. Fairness has no impacts outside of round compared to education that shapes how we understand and operate in the world. Real world impacts come first because we're humans before we're debaters and thus should prioritize helping society over winning debate rounds. Strait and Wallace¹ write,

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories [of] learning like "policy education" and "kririk education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are conductively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives.)

5. **Schools fund debate** for its educational value, not because it's competitive, meaning that if debate is no longer educational it dies as an activity. Debate is often regarded as an educational club, like Science Olympiad, rather than a sport, like tennis, and is funded as such.

6. Debate was **created as an educational activity**, therefore it should reward the skills it values. If it was solely based on fairness, participants would have no reason for joining debate over a coin flipping contest. The reason debate was created and the reason people join it is because it emphasizes critical thinking and argumentative skills. Debate should reward educational benefits because of its function, otherwise the activity becomes pointless.

¹ L. Paul Strait (George Mason University) and Brett Wallace (George Washington University). "The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making." WFU Debater's Research Guide. 2007. [http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/2007/The%20Scope%20of%20Negative%20Fiat%20and%20the%20Logic%20of%20Decision%20Making.pdf]

7. As we become more educated, we better understand how things interact, and thus can come to better conclusions about what is fair, making education a necessary **internal link to fairness**.

Competing interpretations > Reasonability

(**Race to the bottom**) - Reasonability leads to a race to the bottom because there is incentive to push the line of what's reasonable lower and lower as more people start running slightly abusive arguments. This sets a norm for lowering the bar because debaters have an incentive to lower the bar for a competitive advantage. As debaters push the bar lower and arguments seem more reasonable over time as the bar is lowered. This leads to bad debate because any argument can be accepted as reasonable leading away from debate on substance, which makes debate progressively worse. Competing interpretations solves for this by establishing a clear standard for what is the best interpretation.

(**Reasonability has no bright line**, meaning-

a. Can't make a decision to see if it is actually reasonable so don't use it to evaluate arguments.

b. Judges have different views for what is reasonable forcing intervention to decide what is reasonable which is opposite to a fair debate.

c. Even if they make one, it is arbitrary as they get to make it, causing the line to be skewed in their favor.

(**Competing interpretations creates an incentive to promote fair debate because it forces debaters to defend their interpretations**); defending the interpretation is the only way to generate offense on theory, so debaters have incentives to run advocacies consistent with the most fair interpretation, because otherwise they would lose the theory debate.

(**Theory is good**- it allows us to check abuse and make debate the best it can be. Reasonability discourages this because it skews time to run it if they can just get out of it because they're reasonable.

(**Reasonability is an inconsistent method of adjudication**- you as a judge don't use reasonability as a way to evaluate substantive arguments so to be consistent you should evaluate all arguments including theory from a competing interpretations standpoint if a argument is winning more offense even if its marginally it should be preferred.

(**Reasonability creates an incentive for debaters to run arguments that are as abusive as possible** without crossing a threshold that they themselves established. Reasonability pushes the standard of reasonability down because arguments which are only marginally more unfair than other arguments can be construed as within the limits of reasonability. This harms education because there is less engagement on the substantive debate and more generic theory. This is unfair because threshold set up arbitrarily can allow for really abusive cases to be fair, while in reality they destroy my chance to win. Competing interpretations solves for this because there is no bright line and debaters will always be trying to promote the most fair interpretations.

Reasonability > Competing Interpretations

(_) **Competing interp causes race to the top-** Under competing interps, there will always be an interp that's slightly better, meaning we would always run theory because it's a gateway issue. This would distract us from substance, which is the educational part of debate that we can apply to other parts of life; theory can not be applied to anything but high-school debate.

(_) **Destroys creativity-** Competing interpretations forces debaters to think out side the box, forcing them to conform to only arguments that are perfectly fair – otherwise, they would always face theory about a slightly more fair practice. This causes stasis in debate because everyone would run the same “fair” issues over and over again. Reasonability checks back this problem because debaters can be creative when choosing positions as long as they are reasonably fair.

(_) **Contradicts our notions of punishment-** We should only reject debaters/arguments if they are bad, not because they are less good. For instance, we punish people for breaking the law, but not for failing to donate to charity, and not for donating some, but not all, of their money to charity. This makes punishments under competing interps unproportional to the abuse. Proportionality is key to fairness as what is fair is determined by what we are due.

(_) Makes theory **infinitely regressive**. They prep out reasons why both sides of a theory issue would be preferable in order to win on theory no matter what I do- causing endless theory debates. Reasonability solves for theoretical issues that can not be resolved. For instance, there are interps and counter-interps for plans good and plans bad – no matter what I do, I lose. Reasonability stops these no-way-out situations from occurring.

(_) (Only if topicality) People **don't have access to resources** that provide the best definition so reasonability doesn't screw over small schools without the ability to get the best definition.

(_) Reasonability prevents a **race to the bottom** because a significant impact is needed to win the theory debate. A marginal impact is sufficient under competing interpretations, so debaters have an incentive to make their interpretations and counter-interpretations as similar as possible, minimizing points of clash. This makes it impossible for the person responding to theory to win the debate because she has to generate offense off a tiny part of the original interpretation. Further, it harms education because both debaters agree on 90% of the theoretical issues, so they have few opportunities to defend their positions.

Drop the debater, not the argument

(_) Time spent on theory can't be made up- I was forced to run theory and undercover substance meaning dropping the argument doesn't rectify the **time skew**. Also, LD times are short enough that once theory is brought up or abuse occurs, there's simply not enough time to rectify the abuse and get back to a fair round. The implication is that you need to vote off fairness as the round is irrevocably altered away from the substance.

(_) This argument encourages people to run lots of terrible abusive arguments. If my opponent runs a ton of abusive arguments I'll be forced to run theory on each, then my opponent will just kick each and win on substance thus winning the time trade off. That means you have to drop the debater to ensure **argument accountability**.

(_) Vote them down to **deter** future abusive strategies. **Sigel** in 84

[Doug Sigel 1984, "The Punishment Theory: Illegitimate Styles and Theories as Voting Issues," Journal of the American Forensics Association, available online at <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtarticlesIndex.htm>.]

There are at least 4 reasons that can be isolated for voting on punishment positions irrespective of what occurs in the rest of the round. First, most central to the entire notion of **punishment is the deterrent view**. **Just as we punish criminals to deter crime, we should punish debaters who injure the debate** process. A ballot that says "I think you may have won that second DA--but I voted against you based on the illegitimacy of the conditional counterplans you ran" sends a strong message to the teams involved and other participants in the activity that there are high costs of abusive strategies. There does seem to be merit to the negative reinforcement approach to debate.

The arguments and styles that are successful are copied; those that aren't are shunned. While the decision in one round can't by itself fundamentally change debate, a general trend can be initiated and/or reinforced by a decision. The experience of this author has been that, at least in college debate, the threat of punishment now hangs over teams using strategies and styles that are generally regarded as illegitimate. **Deterrence seems especially applicable to the debate setting because the participants have control over their practices.** We all practice judge analysis, trying to adapt to the inevitable likes and dislikes of even the most tabula rasa critic. The **feedback a punishment decision provides is direct: everyone is given notice that the winning team will and can win rounds in the face of abusive debating and that the judge involved will vote against such practices.** It only takes a few instances of punishment

4. Fairness can be maintained only if the debater is punished with the loss for unfair practices.

Sigel 2

[Doug Sigel 1984, "The Punishment Theory: Illegitimate Styles and Theories as Voting Issues," Journal of the American Forensics Association, available online at <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtarticlesIndex.htm>.]

A third reason that can be introduced in support of punishment is fairness. **If it is shown that a given style or theory hurts the debate activity, the abusing team has hurt the educational experience of the abused team. One team invests hundreds of dollars, hundreds of hours, and gives up other educational opportunities only to confront a meaningless experience**--we all have had the feeling after some particularly useless debates that maybe we'd be better off not

debating. Quite simply, the social contract we all make to try to engage in genuine intellectual discourse is breached by those who employ disruptive tactics in order to win. A ballot on the illegitimacy of such disruptive abuses seems the least that can be expected. Competitive equity is also restored by voting on punishment. Abusive tactics are employed to gain strategic advantage: conditional counterplans , for example, imply a geometric increase in the burdens placed upon the affirmative. Incoherent delivery is particularly unfair because a debater can never be sure if the bits and pieces of a speech he understood were the same bits and pieces the judge understood. The way to restore competitive equity is to vote against teams guilty of disrupting the natural competitive opportunity that existed in the absence of abusive tactics. To merely drop-out bad debate practices is to encourage their use--teams will run multiple counterplans, counterwarrants and the like and hope to draw lots of attacks on them to waste the maximum time possible, allowing victory on the other issues. It seems particularly unjust for a team to have to answer multiple counterplans, counterwarrants, and the like and to end up losing on topicality. Only by voting to punish teams employing tactics that are shown to be injurious to debate--in terms of education and fairness--can competitive equity be maintained.

Drop the argument, not the debater

1. Proportionality – It is not proportional for me to lose the round because I violated some rule of debate.:

Roger Solt. "THEORY AS A VOTING ISSUE: THE CRIME OF PUNISHMENT 2002

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtarticlesIndex.htm>

My third argument is that the punishment of voting on theory is almost always disproportionate. To me this seems almost true by definition. Someone advances a “bad” argument. They lose that argument. It is not a decisive argument in terms of the substantive logic of the debate, be that a policy logic, a discursive logic, or a critical logic. But instead of just losing that argument, with whatever logical, limited impact that may have in the round, the team which advanced the “bad” argument suddenly is supposed to lose the whole debate. In other words, every other issue in the round, all of the policy arguments, all of the critical arguments, all of the discursive arguments become moot. They no longer matter and they need not be resolved because one theory argument has been lost.

For me to lose the round my opponent has to be showing that my violation of ground was so egregious that they were unable to make any arguments. Because they made arguments outside of theory, they had the capacity to engage in the substantive debate meaning that it's un-proportional as I am being *prima facie* dropped for me making an argument they wouldn't be *prima facie* dropped for.

2. Making theory a reason to vote down the debater forces debaters to allocate their time on the theoretical debate, therefore detracting from the substantive debate.

- a. Judge willingness to vote down debaters for theory violation incentivizes debaters to run theoretical rather than substantive arguments to win the ballot. **Sigel 1985**: [Punishment: Does It Fit the Crime? Doug Sigel, Northwestern University. 1985 - Clarifying Water Policy]

By expressing a willingness to vote on punishment, judges encourage theory debate at the expense of policy discussion. It is true that abusive debate practices have been a problem. The punishment solution, however, is counterproductive. When one team runs anything slightly creative their opponent immediately whines that it is unfair and uneducational and forces the entire debate away from substance. It seems obvious that a successful strategy against punishment is to argue that voting against bad theory encourages excessive theoretical discussion. If punishment becomes an accepted tactic, teams will nit-pick about violations of fairness and education instead of trying to clash on the issues. The advantages of punishment in terms of stopping bad debate are simply outweighed by the alarming focus away from the policy goals of the activity.

- b. Voting on theory crowds out substantive debate as the massive risk of under covering theory forces me to allocate so much time on it that going for substance becomes unreasonable.
- c. Dropping the debater disincentives innovative argumentation as debaters become threatened by the prospect of loss. Fearing the severe punishment of a loss, debaters will be hesitant if not altogether unwilling to run new arguments fearing that the theoretical illegitimacy of one argument will guarantee a loss despite the legitimacy of the rest of the position.
- d. Dropping the debater incentivizes theory over substance, killing *topic specific* education, because theory is generic and does not differ from topic to topic while the substance of the debate changes from topic to topic. The topic-specific education we garner from a substance debate is preferable compared to a generic theory debate. Therefore reject the argument not the debater so we can focus more on substance.
- e. Substantive argumentation has the only significant value in debate. **Solt** concurs:

Roger Solt. "THEORY AS A VOTING ISSUE: THE CRIME OF PUNISHMENT 2002
<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtarticlesIndex.htm>

The first main argument I would make against punishment is that it exaggerates theory. One view of debate is that it is just a game and that theory is as worthwhile to debate as anything else. In contrast is the view that I would defend: that debate has a substantive intellectual content which it is far more worthwhile to learn about than it is to learn about debate theory. Debate teaches us a great deal about current events and principles of policy analysis, about political theory, political philosophy, and practical politics, about medicine and law, ethics and epistemology. It teaches both problem solving and the criticism of underlying assumptions. And it teaches many other things as well. People disagree about which of these areas of inquiry is most important, but any and all of these subjects are of more intrinsic significance than debate theory.

However, theoretical issues contain no educational value. **Solt** furthers:

Roger Solt. "THEORY AS A VOTING ISSUE: THE CRIME OF PUNISHMENT 2002
<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtarticlesIndex.htm>

I think that we sometimes confuse debate theory with argument theory. I am not arguing that argumentation is not a valid and useful field of thought. And argument theory may intersect with what we commonly think of as "debate theory" at a variety of points. But the vast bulk of debate theory, as argued in competitive debate rounds, really just involves what are appropriate conventions for this particular activity—a contest, sponsored by educational institutions, with a certain format and certain conventions. Are conditional counterplans legitimate? Are plan inclusive counterplans legitimate? Are international counterplans legitimate? Should we assume that the "fiat" of the affirmative plan comes immediately or only after a normal implementation process? Must the affirmative specify an agent? These are the staples of debate theory argument. Especially they are the kinds of issues which most invoke punishment claims. And none of them has particular salience outside the framework and format of contest debate. Of course, it is possible to relate some of these arguments to intellectual controversies beyond competitive debate. For example, a focus on international institutions distinguishes liberalism from realism as foreign policy paradigms. But the debate over international fiat does not draw very heavily on this paradigmatic controversy. And our arguments within competitive debate over the propriety of international fiat does next to nothing to illuminate the liberalism/realism debate within international relations.

3. Dropping the debater leads to the proliferation of bad theory practices as debaters realize the strategic advantage to running theory instead of substance.

a) Dropping the debater incentivizes unfair practices that bait theory that establishes the grounds for an RVI, and thus further avoids substantive debate. **Sigel:**

Doug Sigel writes: [Doug Sigel, Northwestern University. *Punishment: Does It Fit the Crime?* 1985;
<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Sigel985Water.htm>]

First, punishment arguments do not deter bad debate. It has already been argued that sophisticated debaters who run "junk" arguments will eagerly latch onto punishment as another way to avoid research. Some elaboration seems in order. Suppose you and your partner plan on running a world government counterplan nearly every round. Your response to the threat of punishment will be to write detailed briefs) defending the legitimacy of your counterplan. When another team initiates a punishment argument you will "turn" the argument and make it a reverse voting issue. When the 1AR drops numbers 11, 21 and 26 because of time pressure you will likely win the debate. It seems clear that for teams that systematically abuse the activity punishment isn't really a problem. At worst they can muddle up the issue and at best they can win on reverse-punishment.

b) Voting on theory creates a dangerous incentive for theory to be run every round. The general communal norm against RVI's makes theory an unreciprocal, easy way out for one debater. Voting on theory therefore encourages its use in every round, even when there is no actual abuse or when the interpretation is unfair, because it allows one debater to kick theory if their opponent answers it and win on substance OR win on theory if their opponent under covers it. Rejecting the argument checks back this incentive by making debaters think twice about running theory as the time they need to invest on theory is rewarded by only taking out the abusive argument. The incentive then becomes to only run theory if there is clear abuse.

4. Voting the debater down for a theoretical objection exacerbates the consequences of judge bias because devastating consequences are attached to a judge's unpredictable preference for certain arguments. **Solt** warrants:

Roger Solt. "THEORY AS A VOTING ISSUE: THE CRIME OF PUNISHMENT 2002

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtarticlesIndex.htm>

My fourth major argument against punishment is that it is intolerant. All judges have biases which they are only partially successful at screening out. And perhaps oddly, judges often seem less able to set aside their theory biases than their biases on substantive issues. As I noted above, judges can generally justify voting either way on a given theory argument in most rounds. At least if both sides are putting up a decent fight, this is the case. If a position is conceded, most judges will behave accordingly, though even here there are exceptions. And sometimes there will be such a clear preponderance of argument that judges are unable to find their way back to their own theory predispositions. But with two reasonably skilled teams, it is generally possible to resolve a given theory issue either way, so most judges, most of the time, end up endorsing the theory position which they prefer. This may be an unfortunate fact about judges, and it certainly applies to some judges more than to others, but it is a real tendency. It is hardly controversial to say that judges have biases. But the problem with punishment, in light of this fact, is that voting on theory empowers those biases. Instead of creating a strategic slant, the bias becomes all-decisive. What we should recognize, I think, is that different people can and do legitimately hold different concepts of what debate should be about. If one side appeals to our theory preferences and the other side does not, it is not unreasonable to expect that the side whose views we embrace will win the debate over a particular issue more often. But it is intolerant to rule the other side completely out of order, to decide the whole debate based on this one issue, just because they have gotten on the wrong side of one of our theoretical predispositions.

A2 Meaningful Message

Consistency - Theory doesn't send a meaningful message because it would be unreasonable to expect all of my opponents to run the same theory shell my opponent ran against my argument. Therefore, even if I lose this round, I still won't be deterred from running this position in the future as I know other judges will not vote me down in future rounds – and even if judges would vote me down if theory were run, I know that not all of my opponents will run theory.

No Impact – Sending a meaningful message doesn't translate into an action. Schools who ran disclose on the wiki theory certainly sent a powerful message to the debate community, but many people still choose not to disclose. Just because a message is meaningful doesn't mean that it is compelling enough of a reason for people to act on it.

Theory is an RVI

If I win the counter-interpretation or an I meet argument vote, for me because

If theory is an issue of competing interpretations, then you have to vote for the interpretation that is preferable in order to **discourage the worse interpretation**. If theory and counter interpretations are run, the debate must finish there. One of them must be true. We've transcended the realm of substance and have to resolve the discussion on how debate should be in the future, forcing me to debate on the theoretical level, giving me ground for an RVI as that's the ground I have to debate.

1. I must **invest time** in order to answer theory because theory is a gateway issue. This means that to answer theory I must allocate time away from substance. Therefore, the only way for me to reasonably answer theory and not lose is to make theory a 2-way street so that the time I invest on theory is worth the opportunity cost.
RVI's **discourage bad theory** by making people think twice about running theory. Otherwise, debaters will run it every round because it is a no-risk issue and a time suck, giving my opponent a structural advantage in the round. RVI's check this back as they ensure that people won't run bad theory as they know that will be punished. Overuse of theory creates more problems than an RVI ever could.
2. Theory gives my opponent the ability to **go for substance or theory** whereas I must go for both theory and substance. This is un-reciprocal as it gives my opponent twice as many outs in the round than I have. Reciprocity is key to fairness as un-reciprocal positions makes it easier for one debater to win the round.
3. **No risk issues encourage un-educational argumentation** since they encourage kicking arguments even when there are turns and going for less covered issues. This is un-educational because a) it provides competitive incentive for debaters to not engage their opponent's responses because they can just kick it b) encourages debaters to make shallow, blippy arguments just so they get to every argument on the flow because dropped arguments can't be weighed and c) distracts from substantive issues because debaters know that they can't lose on this level, unlike any other level.

RVI Bad Preempts

1. A2 RVIs encourage theory baiting

RVIs don't encourage theory baiting because if the interp is truly unfair, it's impossible to win against someone who understands even basic theory.

2. A2 There is no time skew

Theory takes a lot more time to answer than to run, especially if they had it prepared and I didn't, thus they still have a time skew.

3. A2 I don't need to spend that much time on theory

If my integrity is challenged, I should be able to spend sufficient time defending it as it is more important than other parts of the flow that don't effect my persona. This means I have to spend a lot more time on theory, meaning I have to have the ability to win on it as I have to trade off with substance.

4. A2 RVI's discourage theory

RVI's only discourage bad theory. I only need to run an RVI because my opponent's use of theory is itself abusive. This means that I will not discourage using theory in general as I only get access to the RVI so long as I show that my interpretation is fairer than my opponent's.

5. A2 You shouldn't win for proving your interpretation is more fair

I am not winning solely because my interpretation is fairer. Rather, I am setting up alternative standards which justify me winning off the RVI. I only win off the RVI because running theory as a no risk issue structurally advantages one debater, not because I'm fair.

Theory is not an RVI

You **shouldn't win because you're fair**

- a) Theory is a litmus test to see if my opponent falls under the rules for debate, proving that your argument is not illegitimate is not sufficient for a ballot. If that was true, then any argument would be sufficient for affirmation.
- b) My opponent should not win solely because they are fair. Being fair is a precondition for engaging in the substantive debate. So, him/her winning a fairer interpretation only shows that s/he should have the ability to engage substance.

2. RVIs **Decrease the ability to check back abuse** – RVI's discourage people from running theory, even when there is real abuse in the round, because people know that if they are worse at theory than their opponent they will lose the round. This creates a disincentive to run theory, as people will fear losing solely because they are worse at the theoretical debate than their opponents.

RVIs **Incentivize Unfair Arguments** – If theory is an RVI then debaters are encouraged to run abusive positions because they know that they can kick the arguments and just win off of substance. This puts debaters into a double bind where they either run theory and lose off of the RVI OR they go for substance and lose to the abusive position.

4. RVIs force **prep skew**, for debaters running abusive positions will always be prepared for theory because they know coming into the round what they'll need to defend. Their opponents, however, must divide their pre-round prep between many possible shells. So, allowing debaters to run RVIs and go all-in for theory solidifies the advantage of the one committing the abuse. Forcing debaters to extend offense off substantive issues after responding to theory solves this problem by not allowing debaters to win purely off their pre-round prep.

Chapter 2: Topicality

aff must be topical

Affirmative Needs to be Topical-

A. Interpretation: The affirmative must defend a topical advocacy

B. Violation: The affirmative does not defend a topical advocacy

C. Standards:

1) Research Burdens- when the affirmative defends a non-topical advocacy they only have to research one hyper-specific topic area, while the negative has the burden to develop and research responses to all of the potential random topic areas the affirmative may choose. There is no predictability of what the affirmative will be running. Exploding the negative burden while lessening the affirmative burden destroys fairness because the ballot is not equally accessible if one side is required to do infinitely more work than the other, while keeping research burdens balanced gives both debaters an equal chance to win. Research burdens are key to education because having equal requirements to research the topic as a whole encourages detailed understanding of a topic area instead of requiring a negative's superficially un-educational knowledge of all potential topics.

2) Switch-side debate-

a. If the affirmative is given permission to be un-topical, the debate round would inherently become unfair. A non-topical affirmative advocacy allows the debater to run the same advocacy on both the affirmative and negative, cutting their topic education in half. Since this is a measurable education deficit, prefer this internal link to education over those to other standards.

This is also unfair because my opponent only has to be prepared to defend one side of the resolution whereas I must defend both. Further, my opponent can force me to defend morally reprehensible things – if a debater can choose to defend anything, then their opponent must defend its opposite. My interpretation solves because if the aff must be topical then they cannot run the same advocacy when they affirm and when they negate.

b. Switch-Side debate allows for the value of education to increase.

Douglas G. DAY, Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics at the University of Wisconsin, 1966

[*"The Ethics of Democratic Debate," Central States Speech Journal, Volume 17, February, p.]*

To discover the truth which democratic l[of] debate can provide we must attend "equally and impartially to both sides ... to see the reasons of both in the strongest light.³⁶ One side debating does not meet this ethical obligation. Debating both sides, however, prepares students to contribute maximally to the democratic solution of conflict. Leonard Cottrell has observed: One of the deepest problems of modern society is to deal with the profound and dangerous cleavages that threaten the basic consensus on which the society rests. ... A democratic solution of the problem requires that the citizens interacting in their roles as members of opposing groups become increasingly able to take the roles of their opponents. It is only through this ability that integrative solution of conflict rather than armed truces ran [can] be arrived at.³⁷

c. Without side-switch debate, personal convictions lose significance – Turns the [narrative, advocacy, etc.]

Douglas G. Day, Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics at the University of Wisconsin, 1966
["The Ethics of Democratic Debate," Central States Speech Journal, Volume 17, February, p. /TomC]

Thus, personal conviction can have moral significance in social decision-making only so long as the integrity of debate is maintained. And the integrity of debate is maintained only when there is a full and forceful confrontation of arguments and evidence relevant to decision. When an argument is not presented or is not presented as persuasively as possible, then debate fails. As debate fails decisions become less "wise." As decisions become less wise the process of decision-making is questioned. And finally, if and when debate is set aside for the alternative method of decision-making by authority, the personal convictions of individuals within society lose their moral significance as determinants of social choice.

d. Side switch debate is key to drive debate forward, promote minority viewpoints, and create better advocates for positions

CASEY Harrigan, A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF ARTS, 2008, "A DEFENSE OF SWITCH SIDE DEBATE". TomC

While such pragmatic justifications for SSD are persuasive, they are admittedly secondary to the greater consideration of pedagogy. Although it is certainly true that debate is a game and that its competitive elements are indispensable sources of motivation for students who are otherwise apathetic about academic endeavors, the overwhelming benefits of contest debating are the knowledge and skills taught through participation. The wins and losses (and marginally-cheesy trophies), by and large, are quickly forgotten with the passage of time. However, the educational values of debate are so fundamental that they eventually become ingrained in the decision-making and thought processes of debaters, giving them a uniquely valuable durability. To this end, SSD is essential. The benefits of debating both sides have been noted by many authors over the past fifty years. To name but a few, SSD has been lauded for fostering tolerance and undermining bigotry and dogmatism (Muir, 1993), creating stronger and more knowledgeable advocates (Dybvig and Iverson, 2000), and fortifying the social forces of democracy by guaranteeing the expression of minority viewpoints (Day, 1966). Switching sides is a crucial element of debate's pedagogical benefit; it forms the gears that drive debate's intellectual motor.

e. Side switch debate is key to solve for global warming, disease, international conflict, and nuclear proliferation.

CASEY Harrigan, A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF ARTS, 2008, "A DEFENSE OF SWITCH SIDE DEBATE". TomC

Along these lines, the greatest benefit of switching sides, which goes to the heart of contemporary debate, is its inducement of critical thinking. Defined as "reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do" (Ennis, 1987, p. 10), critical thinking learned through debate teaches students not just how advocate and argue, but how to decide as well. Each and every student, whether in debate or (more likely) at some later point in life, will be placed in the position of the decision-maker. Faced with competing options whose costs and benefits are initially unclear, critical thinking is necessary to assess all the possible outcomes of each choice, compare their relative merits, and arrive at some final decision about which is preferable. In some instances, such as choosing whether to eat Chinese or Indian food for dinner, the importance of making the correct decision is minor. For many other decisions, however, the implications of choosing an imprudent course of action are potentially grave. As Robert

Crawford notes, there are “issues of unsurpassed importance in the daily lives of millions upon millions of people...being decided to a considerable extent by the power of public speaking” (2003). Although the days of the Cold War are over, and the risk that “the next Pearl Harbor could be ‘compounded by hydrogen’” (Ehninger and Brockriede, 1978, p. 3) is greatly reduced, the manipulation of public support before the invasion of Iraq in 2003 points to the continuing necessity of training a well-informed and critically-aware public (Zarefsky, 2007). In the absence of debate-trained critical thinking, ignorant but ambitious politicians and persuasive but nefarious leaders would be much more likely to draw the country, and possibly the world, into conflicts with incalculable losses in terms of human well-being. Given the myriad threats of global proportions that will require incisive solutions, including global warming, the spread of pandemic diseases, and the proliferation of [WMDs] weapons of mass destruction, cultivating a robust and effective society of critical decision-makers is essential. As Louis Rene Beres writes, “with such learning, we Americans could prepare...not as immobilized objects of false contentment, but as authentic citizens of an endangered planet” (2003). Thus, it is not surprising that critical thinking has been called “the highest educational goal of the activity” (Parcher, 1998).

3. Division of Ground- the affirmative is able to defend the best ground period if they do not have to be topical as they can pick the topic and defend whatever side of it they wish, which destroys fairness because they divide ground such that I have to argue against claims which cannot be contested such as “the sky is blue”, which my interpretation solves because it binds them by the constraints of the ground allocated by the topic so that division of ground is fair and there are defensible arguments on both sides.

4. Ensures Clash – if the affirmative is not constrained to the topic, clash becomes impossible. The affirmative could literally pick anything and the negative would find it impossible to generate offense, killing fairness and the educational value in the debate.

5. Topic good - The process of researching a new topic which we didn’t know before is where we gain most of the educational benefit from debate – attempting to side step it like the affirmative throws away all the knowledge and preparation the negative has brought into the round. The whole point of debate is the debate the resolution to gain educational values out of it.

6. Tournament Contract- By entering a tournament, you must abide by the tournament rules and conduct. As part of the agreement, it is required that all debaters must debate topically. By not respecting this rule, you not only break your contract with the tournament, but you also break your promise to all debaters participating in that tournament. Because of these violations, the offending team should be rejected before any other voters.

Reasonability for topicality

Causes race to the top

There will always be an interpretation that's slightly better, meaning that we will always run theory because it's a gateway issue. This will distract us from substance which is the educational part of debate that we can apply to other parts of life while theory cannot be applied to anything but high-school debate.

Stasis- Running competing interpretation discourages debaters to think outside the box, forcing them to conform to only arguments that is the best rather than what is reasonable. It deters debaters from running creative arguments because they are slightly less good.

Contradicts our notions of punishment- Reasonability is consistent with how we punish people. Someone is not culpable only because they didn't act in accordance with the highest standard of righteous action. Rather, someone is only culpable if they did something wrong. Similarly, reasonability only punishes someone if they did something wrong.

There is no such thing as a “best definition” so the notion of competing interpretations is conceptually flawed as we can never attain a “best” interpretation. Topicality should therefore be an issue of reasonability as that avoids the impossibility of finding a “perfect” interp.

(If Negating) Because the affirmative speaks last, they will always be able to win a slightly fairer interpretation in the 2AR. That means that competing interpretations creates a **huge structural advantage for the affirmative debater**.

Competing interpretations is more relevant to non-topic specific debate practice because other debate practice can continue to be theoretically illegitimate indefinitely whereas an affirmative can only be non-topical on a given resolution for two months. The abuse from not having the *most* topical definition/position is not lasting, so reasonability makes more sense.

Extra-topicality Bad

Interpretation: Interpretation: The affirmative must garner offense only from topical links between their advocacy and the resolution (may not advocate extra-topical action in addition to the resolution)

Violation: The aff is garnering impacts from non-topical actions/actors
Standards

1. Predictability

All I have to prepare with before the round is the resolution. If the aff is allowed to not have to be completely topical, it is impossible for me to predict what they will advocate when entering the round. Limiting aff advantages to the topic establishes predictability because then I will have a general idea what my opponent will run. Unpredictable arguments are unfair because I only have four minutes to think of responses while s/he has much more time to prepare his case and frontlines, placing me at a structural disadvantage. Predictable arguments foster education because we can prepare advocacies that distinctly clash, creating the best discussion and enabling us to access the educational benefits of debate.

2. DA ground

Extratopicality limits neg DA ground because they can add any nonresolutional plank to their advocacy in order to take out DA advantages and solve for uniqueness. Topical affs do not harm DA ground because then people cannot add words to the resolution, enabling the neg, to run competitive DAs. DA ground is key to fairness because they are the only way the neg can generate independent offense. It fosters education because DAs provide the best clash with aff advantages, creating discussion and therefore more educational benefits.

3. Impact ground

Extratopical positions explode the debater's impact ground because they get access to literally every impact if they are allowed to not have to be completely topical. I solve for this because I ensure that the aff is held to the text of the resolution, so s/he can only get the impacts defined by the resolution. Explosion of impact ground is unfair because he will always be able to outweigh the NC because he can just pick the best impacts for the situation. This also harms education because the round will devolve into whoever can pick the worst harm instead of actually discussing the various nuances of an issue.

4. Research Burdens

By running extra-topicality, the aff is able to bring infinite non-topical arguments into play. This is unfair to the neg who now has to research an endless list of arguments that are non-topical. Exploding the neg burden while lessening the aff. burden destroys fairness because the ballot is not equally accessible if one side is required to do infinitely more work than the other, while keeping research burdens balanced gives both debaters an equal chance to win. Research burdens are key to education because having equal requirements to research the topic as a whole encourages detailed understanding of a topic area instead of requiring a neg's superficially uneducational knowledge of all potential topics.

5. Strategy skew

The extra-topical advocacy forces the neg to defend the equivalent of PICS without solvency advocates because of the extra-topical advantages claimed by the aff that I can now not incorporate as part of my advocacy absent the use of a PIC. This destroys fairness because it forces me to advocate positions I was not prepared to defend and which are more difficult to defend than traditional non-topical counter plans with solvency advocates, as well as forces me to be theoretically questionable if I am to generate offense, which creates a structural disadvantage in favor of the aff.

Extra-topicality good

Interpretation: The affirmative may advocate non-topical actions as long as the solvency advocate of the plan advocates both the extra-topical and topical action

Standards

1. Breadth

Limiting nontextual advantages decreases the breadth of the arguments discussed in the round, as they are constrained only to the text of the resolution. Nontextual advantages increase breadth because they force debaters to consider more issues than those contained in the text. Increasing breadth increases fairness because it enables debaters to make new types of arguments, therefore expanding their ground and expanding debaters' abilities to prove their advocacies. Breadth increases education because we debate many rounds on a topic over the course of two months and many positions are widely used, so it is more educational to discuss issues that, while related to the topic, are unique enough to provide new educational benefits.

2. PIC ground

Limiting nontextual advantages decreases my ability to combat PICs because the neg can co-opt all of my textual advantages and I will have no external advantages to weigh against them. Allowing me to garner extratopical advantages allows me to check neg PICs because I can now capture the same benefits and weigh an external benefit against the neg counterplan. Limiting PIC ground is key to fairness because PICs take away 100 percent of my ground, placing me at a complete disadvantage in winning the round. Limiting PIC ground also benefits education because PICs eliminate any clash in the round, killing discussion and therefore the educational benefits to be obtained from debating.

4. Turn ground

Limiting nontextual aff. advantages harms neg turn ground because s/he can only make turns that deal with the text of the resolution. These advantages expand neg turn ground because s/he has more ground to make turns on. Ground is key to fairness because it determines the arguments that debaters are able to make, so restrictions on ground limit the debater's ability to prove his/her advocacy. Increasing turn ground fosters education because debaters now have the ability to make a greater range of responses, therefore sparking more clash and more discussion on relevant issues.

5. Aff flexibility

Limiting nontextual advantages harms me because I am already put at a disadvantage due to LD's time skew and do not have the ability to make the same number of detailed arguments as the neg. Allowing me to claim nontextual advantages helps me combat this inherent disadvantage. Aff. flexibility is key to fairness because the aff. is already placed at an unfair position at the beginning of the debate round, so concessions should be made to allow me to place myself on an even playing field. Aff. flex aids education by allowing the aff. to choose a more obscure or involved advocacy, leading to debate over potentially new issues.

(If reading the advocacy as passing a bill that includes other planks)

a. Most real world

Bills aren't simply one act or plank, they contain multiple actions. Thus, allowing the aff. to be extratopical would create debates that mirror reality, and thus, are the most educational.

Why we need to be real-world

The scope of neg fiat and the logic of decision making. L. Paul Strait George Mason University and Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

b. Literature basis

Most literature doesn't talk about whether one part of a policy is a good idea or not, it talks about whether the policy as a whole is a good idea. Thus, this non-uniques predictability impacts because it is how the literature frames the issue, and literature is where we conduct research and the is basis on which we create arguments.

Aff flexibility good

1. In the status quo there is a huge **neg bias** because of time skew – the neg gets 7 minutes to generate offense, which the aff has to cover in 4 minutes, then the 2NR has 6 minutes to close doors on the aff. This means that there is an imbalance in fairness in the status quo that must be rectified. Limiting neg ground in comparison to aff thus becomes necessary as if the neg has less strategic options they can do less damage in the NC making the AR easier and also have less good arguments to go for in the 2NR.
2. Structurally the aff is at a disadvantage since I **don't know what the neg is going to say in the NC**, meaning the neg has 7 minutes to find some arguments which my AC won't apply too, or use things like PICS and counterplans to mitigate the AC offense and then outweigh with turns and disads. This means we need to limit the neg's strategic options since they shouldn't be able to screw over the AC, or I'd lose 6 minutes of speech time every round.
3. The aff strategic options and advocacies are already **artificially constrained by topicality**, meaning the number of possible ways to derive offense as the aff is severely limited. In contrast, the neg does not have to be topical – so as long as they can find some net benefit, they can make an infinite number of arguments and can have an infinite number of advocacies which I can't predict, meaning the aff needs flexibility in dealing with neg arguments and we need to impose some constraints on neg ground in comparison to aff ground.
4. Flexibility is needed for **breadth of research**, otherwise the aff would have no incentive to research a broad range of possible advocacies. This means that we would not learn about a variety of different stances in support of the topic, but only a limited number, constraining the education obtained from research.

aff flexibility Bad

1. Aff flexibility takes away neg ground by **over-limiting the negative**. This is bad because it is unfair to arbitrarily take away neg ground while allowing the aff to choose any ground they want; and, it is uneducational because it forces negatives to all go for the same argument rather than be creative and run for unique and creative positions.
2. Aff flexibility is bad because it gives the aff **too much ground**. This occurs because when you underlimit the aff, it opens up a multitude of arguments that normally would not be allowed. This gives the aff an unfair advantage because it undermines predictability for the neg; so, to have a chance at winning, negatives must be prepared to refute almost anything which is an unfair prep expectation.
3. The fact that the aff sucks at affirming doesn't mean they should be put at an advantage. Going into the round we both have an exactly equal amount of speech time meaning that we are at **relative equality at the start of the round**. The fact that the allocation of time is different just implies that aff and neg debaters need different skill sets, not that one is better than the other by definition. So, there is no reason to say one side is advantaged. Thus, we should not artificially limit one side's ground.
4. The aff gets to **speak first and last**, meaning that the aff gets the last word on any argument. In order to check this back the neg needs access to a greater quantity of arguments than the aff, and of more varied kind, since that allows the neg to make it harder for the 2AR to simply put the best response on every response. Without being able to check back the aff's structural advantage in speaking last, the aff would have the advantage on every argument.
5. Since debaters want to win, flexibility encourages affirmatives to pick the best possible advocacy for their side rather than the **best possible topic for discussion**. I can't claim the same advantage because I have the burden of rejoinder, so I cannot weigh the best possible neg advocacy against the AC. The only way to give both sides an equal opportunity is to tie the aff to a single concrete interpretation

Framer's Intent Good

1. Framer's intent makes the arguments in the round **more predictable**. Interps based upon framer's intent are predictable as topic papers or articles in debate forums published by either the wording committee or the author of the topic are often publicly available. Thus all debaters can analyze the resolution in the same way, rather than forcing debaters be prepared to defend a huge range of arguments as a result of the varying ways in which the resolution is interpreted. This creates fairness and adds educational value as debaters no longer have to waste time analyzing the resolution, and instead have more substance.
2. The topic committees who create the resolution attempt to make it one that maximizes the **educational value** of the debate. They are educators elected specifically to research and decide which is the best topic and best way to debate these topics. High-school debaters do not know more about how we ought to debate than a trained professional. Simply put, the wording committee is more qualified to interpret the resolution than we are.

Framer's Intent Bad

1. Because there is no requirement that articles on proposed topics be written in LD, it is often unclear as to what topic authors actually mean because there is no written point of reference for framer's intent. Thus, framer's intent is subjective and unverifiable, so instead of clarifying the debate, it only muddles it further.
2. Since the wording committee alters the wording of the resolution, resolutions cannot always be debated in a way indicative of what the framer intended. The changes in the wording of the topic preclude framer's intent from being a viable standard for T.
3. Framer's intent is not static; people who write topics change their mind about issues as they see them progress in a certain direction they did not anticipate. Further, the way the topic relates to the real world changes as current events develop, and the framer's intent can not foresee these changes. So, using framer's intent as a T standard is nonsensical as T interpretations have to be applicable to all debates on the topic, and to the real world.

4. Originalism is bad.

Lawrence B. Solum-2008, [John E. Cribbet Professor of Law, University of Illinois College of Law,] "Semantic Originalism," Illinois Public Law and Legal Theory Research Papers Series No. 07-24 <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/constitutionalism/#BM10> "Constitutionalism" First published Wed Jan 10, 2001; substantive revision Tue Feb 20, 2007

Originalism faces a number of difficulties, some shared with Textualism. For example, original intentions are often unclear, if not completely indeterminate, leaving the interpreter with the need to appeal to other factors. The original intentions of the authors of a constitution can vary from one person to the next. Sometimes the only things upon which joint authors of a text can agree are the words chosen. The intentions behind that choice can, however, vary significantly. These can range, for example, from the very general to the highly specific. At one end of the spectrum are the various, and sometimes conflicting goals and values the authors of a provision intended their creation to achieve. At the other end are the very specific applications the authors might have had in mind when they chose the particular words upon which they settled. Did the intended applications of an equality provision encompass equal access to the legal system by all groups within society? Or only something more specific like equal access to fairness at trial? Did they perhaps include equal economic and social opportunities for all groups within society? Different authors might have "intended" all, none, or some of these applications when they agreed upon the equality provision. And as with the general goals and values underlying a provision, there is room for inconsistency and conflict. Constitutional authors, no less than legislators, union activists, or the members of a church synod, can have different goals and applications in mind and yet settle on the same set of words. In light of this fact, it is often unhelpful to rely on original intentions when interpreting a constitution.

5. The framers are debate coaches, not experts in the many fields that resolutions cover, and so what they intended the text to mean may not be accurate to the topic.

6. The committee is **political**. They vote for other topics in order to get their own topics voted for. Thus, framer's intent is bad, as the topics aren't chosen for educational purposes but instead because of backhand dealing.

Under-limiting bad

Under limiting explodes the number of topical affs, skewing negs' ability to prep so many possible positions. This gives affs preferable research burdens since they only have to prep their one advocacy, while negs are forced to prep every remotely related issue on a broad topic.

Under-limited explodes the neg research burden, forcing negatives to attempt to cut cards against a massive quantity of positions. This means that negative research will be of poor quality and negs will never get to go in-depth on any issue. Thus, under-limiting harms education.

Over-limiting bad

Over-limiting creates **strategy skew**. My strategy to win this round was to prove the entirety of the resolution untrue. Because of the affirmative advocacy, I am forced to now change my strategy to prove a tiny part of the resolution untrue. This means that my strategy has been completely changed because of the limits the affirmative advocacy places on the resolution.

Over-limiting allows one debater to become a specialist in the particular argument that they advocate; this **skew in depth of research** on an issue chosen by the advocate determines who garners the ballot. This creates an unfair disadvantage for the aff as over limiting causes the aff to provide only few arguments under this standard. This would undermine the value of fairness in that debating ought not have an unbalanced ratio on who wins the round.

Precision Good

Precision is good:

Resolutional integrity – the framers included each word for a reason, and their intent is critical to a predictable debate – the more precise we are, the more predictable and fair. (Use with reasons that framer's intent is good)

Real world – In the real world proposals aren't taken up if they employ words without meaning in the statement. Every word counts in the real world, so every word should count in debate.

Precision is needed to determine whether an argument serves for the neg or aff. In order to distinguish this, a **bright line is required**; precision provides that bright line. You can not make an evaluation of who wins the round if it is not clear whose side of the resolution certain arguments fall on.

Precision Bad

Absolute precision is detrimental to education because it deters innovation. Having “wiggle-room” at the margins gives debaters a competitive incentive to explore new issues that are related to the topic. This is an educational benefit because debaters learn about new topics rather than remaining static while still preserving the depth of argumentation. Also, having a gray area forces debaters to defend the theoretical legitimacy of their own positions, rather than just assuming if their position is topical via some defined boundary. A T debate demands that debaters think on their feet and critically examine their own practices, which is arguably the most important skill that debaters can take from the activity. Shutting this debate out by having a super precise definition denies this educational benefit.

Word focus kills fairness first by making it impossible for the aff to win because the neg can bring up so many definitions of phrases and words that it's impossible for me to meet all of them. Furthermore, by forcing me to define all terms in the AC, it forces me to spend all my time on definitions, making it impossible for the aff to generate offense. Thus, precision exacerbates neg win skew.

Precision doesn't exist for either Competitive interpretation or reasonability.

Eric Kupferberg, University of Kentucky

Most articles on topicality devote their attention to the two dominant schools of topicality standards *reasonability* and *best definition*. Debaters have dutifully compiled long lists of reasons in support of one or the other or both outlooks.. However, such analysis inevitably suffers from two pitfalls. First, the shortcomings debaters invent usually are mutually applicable to either standard (e. g., both reasonability and best definition standards are highly subjective and prone to judge intervention). And, second, *neither* standard can be easily defined with precision. More often than not, debaters make impassioned pleas for what is 'best" or reasonable without providing adequate guidelines to determine what completely constitutes either standard. Neither school offers any compelling criteria by which to judge whether the larger 'standard" has been met.

Field Context Good

Specific authors and groups in different field contexts will have **more merit** than non-experts. People who are in certain field contexts will have studied the issue(s) for many years and have most likely written many papers on the subject. They will have better credentials and thus more credibility in their area of expertise. Thus they will provide better definitions compared to people who try to create general definitions that may or may not represent the actual usage of the term

Field context is the most relevant source because the subject matter uses **terms of art** that originate from the documentation of the said subject matter. Thus, we can look to individuals experts on the subject to understand their particular usage and ensure that the most appropriate vocabulary is being used in correlation with the subject matter described by the resolution.

Adhering to the context of certain words or phrases actually allows for a **more educational** debate because it forces the debaters to become familiar with definitions in the field of study and allows debaters to study the subject of the resolution and the substance of arguments.

Field specific definitions are **most predictable** because they are the definitions we encounter while doing topic specific research. Predictable definitions are key to fairness because affirmatives and negatives can only be expected to write cases for predictable interpretations of the resolution otherwise debaters would be forced to write cases for every possible permutation of interpretations of words, which would be virtually impossible.

Field Context Bad

Field context definitions are disputed. Not all authors believe in the same definitions for different concepts in the world of academia. There are often many definitions that are given for various concepts sometimes even within the same context. They are all disputed and affirmed by various scholars.

Field context specific definitions often take on field specific meanings which rely on an extensive prior knowledge of the field to interpret correctly. This means that **debaters may not be qualified to interpret** or understand field specific definitions and will just misconstrue the meanings of the words in round. Thus, because debaters lack the ability to correctly present expert definitions, any advantage to using field definitions is mooted by the fact that it is not a direct representation of academia, but rather of some debater's [mis]interpretation.

Contextual definitions derived from topic literature leave room for **bias and subjectivity** since different authors have competing claims on what different terms mean. Because academics write papers with an end in mind, academia has an incentive to manipulate definitions in their favor to achieve that end. Even if literature is peer reviewed, there is still no way to check back for the inherent partialities different authors have regarding the way phrases are defined in their field.

FX-T Bad

A) Interpretation - The affirmative advocacy must be directly topical.

B) Violation – The AC is only topical through its effects

C) Standards -

1) Limits - if the affirmative is not required to defend an advocacy that in and of itself affirms the resolution, it becomes impossible for the neg to predict the countless potential affirmative advocacies that do not directly affirm resolution but whose *solvency* is the affirmation. Being required to advocate a direct affirmation of the resolution narrows the scope of potential aff advocacies, giving the neg a general idea of what to expect when entering a round. Predictability is key to fairness because the aff has a greater chance of accessing the ballot than the neg who was severely Disadvantaged with lack of previous knowledge of the arguments in the round. Predictability is also key to education because unpredictable advocacies decrease in depth argumentation and clash because one debater will not have appropriate preparation to develop well-warranted responses.

2) Counterplan ground - the affirmative denies crucial strategic counterplan ground by claiming a way to solve for the harms of other affirmative advocacies while achieving an external net-benefit from the extra-topical advocacy. My interpretation effectively prohibits aff's usage of such ground and thus returns counterplan ground to the negative which is entitled to run alternative solvency mechanisms for the aff. Counterplan ground is crucial negative ground because it is key to fairness in debate because it clearly defines which arguments debaters are and are not allowed to make, and so by taking the negatives ground, the aff is taking the neg's capability to make arguments. Thus loss of such critical ground destroys fairness. Counterplan ground is also key to education because if the affirmative steals counter-plan ground, debate loses the educational clash over the plan v counterplan debate because the plan is altogether eliminated from the round if the aff defends the counterplan.

3) D/A Ground - Permitting the affirmative to gain topical impacts through non-topical advocacies gives them the ability to access D/A ground because they can link into neg specific impacts through advocacies that aren't topical. By disallowing this fairness is increased because the neg maintains ground that should only be theirs and is only gained by a non-topical advocacy. This also increases education in the round because it causes the affirmative to come up with new advocacies that have new impacts which furthers their general knowledge.

4) Research skew - We do research in preparation for the topic if the affirmative advocacy has nothing to do with the topic or only does the aff by effects it skews prep this is an internal link to fairness because the aff can do specific research on just one advocacy while the negatives research is void because the affirmative doesn't affirm the resolution its also an internal link to

education because if one side doesn't have any prep against an aff it destroys clash and topic specific education.

D) Voter -

Fx T Good

A. Interpretation - The Affirmative may garner textual impacts from the effects of their advocacy

B: I Meet, my plan is effects topical

Standards:

Turn Ground- The effects topical component of the aff advocacy gives the neg impact and link turn ground against this component, which is key to fairness because it is the only way for the neg to generate weighable offense against the aff absent an external link chain, giving the negative a greater chance of winning the debate and preserving competitive equity.

Link Ground: FX-T provides extra link ground because I have to win 100% of the link to be topical. This provides the neg with more ground to make the most offensive arguments possible, plus if they get a risk of their link turns or defense, not only do I not get access to my impacts but I don't meet their interpretation and I loose the round there. This checks back any abuse from the original advocacy because it makes the AC a hulking target for NC offense. (increase in ground offset any advantages)

Breadth of Discussion- My interpretation promotes breadth of discussion as it allows debaters to discuss arguments such as the way by which a given aff is effects topical, which is unique education because these arguments are otherwise unrelated to the topic. This is key to education because it ensures that we learn new things about a variety of issues within debate rounds.

Breadth of Research- Allowing affirmatives to run effects topical positions promotes broader research because our research is no longer limited to the scope of topic literature and plans that fall within the scope of the definition of words in the resolution, but rather anything that would result in a topical advocacy, which is educational because

a: it incentivizes debaters to take new and innovative approaches to researching the topic to find effects topical advocacies, promoting creative thinking and

b: it forces debaters to read more about various subjects and learn more about those things overall

Real World Decision Making

Debate is only a valuable activity if we use it as a means to making informed decisions. The benefits we derive from debate are those which can apply outside of debate. Therefore, we ought to value arguments which correspond to real world decision making. My opponent's interpretation prevents real world decision making as when legislators propose policy decisions, they understand that doing so has tangentially related benefits. Policy makers do not exclude such benefits solely because doing so would go against the initial plan, as they realize that the tangentially related effects of their plan are beneficial in addition to the plan. My interpretation better achieves real

world decision making as the additional impacts I gain mimic the additional benefits policy makers derive when they implement their plans. This is better for fairness as it ensures that we take on the entire advocacy of our solvency advocates meaning that discounting such benefits is disingenuous to the topic literature and debaters can only formulate answers to arguments that fall within the topic literature. Also, this is best for education as embracing the real world implications of our arguments ensures that we gain the out of round educational benefits from debating.

Aff Flexibility

The aff needs to be flexible in order to counteract the empirical truth the neg debaters win most frequently. The neg debater doesn't have a topicality burden, so to increase flexibility, the aff must have multiple ways to access topicality. My opponent's interpretation hurts flexibility as it restricts my access to topicality whereas my interp allows me to access topicality in multiple different ways. This increases fairness as it checks the massive negative win skew. It also increases education because it allows me to substantively engage the flow and spark topical discussions by preventing the neg from capitalizing on their inherent advantages.

Legal Definitions Bad

1) Looking toward legal definitions ignores a huge necessary part of the **topic literature**. Analyzing the opinions of people who actually live under the situation described in the resolution is valuable. If we start to talk about a previously ignored issue in topic literature we gain a lot.

2) Variability - The legal definition of something changes from country to country, and even from region to region within those countries. Thus, my opponent using legal definitions would be unpredictable and unfair because he/she could choose the laws of any place he/she chooses, and would require me to know the legal systems of every country.

3) No Relevance - Legal definitions do not make sense in the context of LD resolutions. LD resolutions place a heavy emphasis on ethical standards – while they may include legal themes, the point of LD isn't to interpret the law, it is to evaluate moral claims.

4) Legal definitions are generally from law reviews, which are **not peer reviewed**. Thus, legal definitions may not even truly reflect the law. So you can ignore legal definitions good impacts, and this is a reason that legal definitions are bad because it means that there is no standard or quality control. Thus, you should prefer

Legal Definitions Good

A) Better limits – legal definitions give the most limiting interpretations of words, they draw a clear standard of what is and is not under the law. This creates predictable debate and neg ground because it is easier to identify compared to a vague dictionary definition.

B) Legal definitions are unbiased. They are based off the law, which is designed to be as unbiased as possible, and as a result, are the most fair form of a definition because they do not inherently favor one side. This increases education because both debaters are able to engage in substantial clash and develop a depth of understanding.

D) Legal interpretations draw the clearest bright line. Something is either within the law, or not within the law. A legal definition is written in a way making it obvious whether or not something fits the definition.

(Then you read bright line good arguments)

E) Legal definitions are key to understanding the meaning of legal terms of art (i.e. warrant means a legal permission to search and seize, not a justification) which is key to education because we do not learn anything about a topic if we don't know what the terms of art mean because we cannot comprehend the meaning of the resolution, precluding us from being educated by debating the topic.

Contextual Definitions Bad

Contextual definitions are biased. Because of the fact that contextual definitions come from the topic literature, that literature can be biased towards a certain position or biased against a certain position. Dictionary definitions are objective and not subjective like many contextual definitions. Simply put, authors contextually define terms to coincide with their advocacy. This frames the debate in one's advantage, which is definitionally unfair.

Circular Logic: The notion of a contextual definition is flawed, because context is also debatable. My opponent's reasoning is circular because they define a specific context and say a definition meets that context but they also define their context based on their definitions.

Inaccessible - By defining terms in context we limit predictability because Contextual definitions are not always accessible. Dictionary definitions are the most accessible definition. Contextual definitions could be ambiguous or could hard to find. Many authors in the field do not even give you definitions while a dictionary if you open it gives you multiple definitions. By limiting predictability were are inherently limiting fairness as it requires more research to be done by the opposition in order to adequately respond to the definition.

Contextual Definitions Good

Textuality: The meaning of words in language only have relevance when considered in the context of the sentence or phrase they are used in. The same words often have different meanings or implications when used in a different sentence, thus, we must consider the purpose of the sentence as a whole piece before we can determine the definitions of the individual words. Thus, contextual definitions provide debaters with a solid interpretation of the information being offered and create a clearer universal understanding of what is trying to be communicated. This consistency is key to fairness because it is impossible to make arguments if the resolution makes no sense. It is also key to education, as we cannot research or effectively argue about gibberish.

Consistency: This is the biggest internal link to any other standard as words are not isolated but mean things as terms of art. All other sources depend on them defining the right thing, but defining self-isolated words perverts their definition. Topic lit can only define things if its in the context of the resolution and not single words and grammatical rules change when multiple words are stung together. Commonly used things like hot dog on make sense in context- it doesn't mean a warm canine.

Predictability: Contextual definitions are more predictable because they are derived from the topic literature. Since our understandings of a topic are based solely on the literature we read, terms which are defined outside of the topic literature are unpredictable. Predictability is key to fairness as debaters need to be able to predict an argument to formulate a coherent strategy to answer it. Unpredictable position creates an asymmetrical prep advantage for my opponent as they can block out my case but I can't block out their arguments.

Dictionary definitions good

1. **Dictionary definitions are credible and objective** because they are provided by credible sources, which ensure that they have accurate, objective definitions. Unlike other sources, dictionary definitions carry no motive for their users to reach any conclusions on the provided definitions, so they serve as objective compilations of definitions.

2. **A dictionary determines common usage**. With the determination of common usage the debater is able to use a definition that is within the norms of quotidian English. The dictionary ranks the definition in the order of what is most commonly used. This allows for the debaters to select the most commonly used definition to avoid being biased and abusive. The commonly used definition provides an ample amount of predictability. Therefore, the debaters are aware of the expectations of what definition would appear.

3. **A dictionary is accessible to everyone**. Therefore its definitions are predictable to everyone. They aren't elitist and exclude people; though you can't find dictionaries anywhere, they are easily the most accessible unbiased resource for reference in comparison to an objective but inaccessible elitist article.

dictionary definitions bad

1. A definition is just that of an isolated word that ignores the larger context provided by the syntax of the resolution and of the words surrounding the one being defined. Furthermore, words are defined not phrases. As a result the contextual definition may be different than that provided by defining each word of the resolution in a dictionary. Thus, looking only to dictionary definitions provides a false interpretation of the resolution.
2. Dictionaries categorize definitions by common usage, but oftentimes the most common usage of a word is not the one that debaters want to look for. We require external knowledge or literature to define certain words, because resolutions have empirically used words varying from the common-usage definitions found in dictionaries.

Bidirectionality good

1. Bi-directionality gives **more ground to both sides** because they can derive offense from both sides of an issue, meaning that there is more possibility for offense. S/he will say that this offense would force them to contradict themselves however, there same possibility for contradiction exists for both the aff and neg making this response irrelevant.

2. Bidirectionality opens the discussion to a wide range of potential interpretations, **increasing opportunity** for debaters **to be educated** on the topic. Limiting the debate to only center around one of the possibilities presented by the resolution unfairly limits the amount of education that debaters could receive during competition.

Bidirectionality bad

1. Bidirectionality puts me in a double bind where any argument I make against one argument can be leveraged as a contradiction or an argument for my opponent on the other side. Thus bidirectionality uniquely destroys my position by making it so that any argument I make is a potential argument that can be used against me, destroying my ability to have a cohesive strategy in round and meaning that I always lose.

2. Treating the resolution as though it has bidirectional signals causes my opponent's position to become highly unpredictable, as s/he could take very different approaches to ostensibly arguing the same side. This is unfair because it prevents me from formulating a cohesive strategy to exclude aff/neg argumentation, since my opponent could just opt to argue at the other extreme. I must be given the opportunity to develop and execute a strategy in the limited time provided, but my opponent makes this impossible and places me at an inherent disadvantage.

3. Bi-directionality destroys a precise separation of ground by making two sides of an issue possible neg or aff arguments, meaning that bi-directionality destroys a clear conception of whether an argument will warrant an aff or neg ballot. A clear division of ground is key to fairness because confused division of ground leads to confused strats and unclear rounds, and unclear round necessitate intervention to make a decision, which is the opposite of fairness.

4. Bidirectionality steers debates from clash, as debaters will just skirt the issue by arguing another approach that “technically” affirms/negates. It is strategic for my opponent to argue the position that my case does not directly clash with, so s/he has an incentive to do so and thus diminish the educational value obtained through clash and a dialectic approach to resolving the topic.

5. This means that debaters who use bi-directionality have literally no limitation on possible arguments, since they can even take both sides on one issue and claim both sides go both ways, meaning there is a literally infinite amount of advocacies. This under-limitation of ground should be rejected as debaters can't prepare for every argument, and thus the debater utilizing bi-directionality would always win.

6. Bidirectionality has no real-world applicability because, in the real world, it's impossible to be on both sides of an issue, either you advocate for taking troops out of Iraq or you advocate something else, policy makers and any real world decision maker could never logically hold both stances at once. Real world decision making is the most important impact realistic decision making has the largest link to education. **L. Paul Strait writes.**

L. Paul Strait (George Mason University) and Brett Wallace (George Washington University). “The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making.” WFU Debater’s Research Guide. 2007.
<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/2007/The%20Scope%20of%20Negative%20Fiat%20and%20the%20Logic%20of%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key still. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing.
Decision-making transcends all boundaries between categories of learning like “policy education” and “kritik education,” it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are

going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

7. A judge has no jurisdiction over a bi-directional resolution because it can't be only good or bad because it must include its own opposite.

Common usage good

1. Common usage is **key to predictability** because common usage implies that we actually use such terms in a certain way every day, and that most people understand such terms in this way. Because the resolution is written in order to appeal to a community of debaters as opposed to English majors, we must look to common usage in order to properly interpret the resolution. Furthermore, language is best defined by its common use, and if the English language is most often used to communicate ideas conversationally or directionally, than we should look to the vocabulary of conversational English to interpret the resolution. Thus assigning common definitions to words is the most predictable option. Predictability is key to fairness because debaters have to be able to predict arguments to ensure there's an ability to be responsive and thus win the round.
2. Utilizing the common usage of words in the resolution allows debaters to exercise **application to the real-world**. Without following commonly accepted standards we lose the main educational part of debate since most of debate is the ability to intelligibly express yourself to others; the only method this can be done is through the use of conversational English. The purpose of debate is that people can articulate arguments in a relevant and coherent matter – debate is a speaking activity. Thus the main educational activity of debate is the ability to be articulate to many people and be convincing.

Common usage bad

People can use words in multiple different and historically inaccurate ways, creating **imprecise definitions** of words. For example the word tight can mean angry or cool or taut in common usage or depending on where in the US you are, meaning that common usage encourages bad debate because of imprecise definitions.

Because resolutions are written with enough obscurity provided to allow some variety in interpretation, we must remember that resolutions are not written in conversational English. Furthermore, if the individual debater were to interpret the resolution based on their most accessible resource for common usage (their own knowledge and usage of English on a daily basis), they would subjectively decide the meaning of each word based on their own usage which is also determined on their location, preference, etc. Because common usage doesn't provide a consistent definition amongst individuals, and is thus **unpredictable** it shouldn't be preferred as a resource for interpretation in debate. Lack of predictability in round fails to achieve fairness for both sides in the round.

Common usage provides **ambiguity** in round as well as **instability** in the constantly evolving definitions of words used in everyday speech.

Attig, John "General Reflections on the Concept of Common Usage" Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, July 21, 2003

It's Ambiguous: Ambiguities: Common usage does not make clean distinctions and uses terms that overlap or have very fuzzy boundaries. In the case of sound recordings, the term "disc" is commonly applied to both analog and digital technologies. The more common term for digital discs is "compact disc" or simply "CD" but we also need a term for analog discs; at the moment, the preferred term seems to be "vinyl disc" — which brings us to the next problem:

Attig, John "General Reflections on the Concept of Common Usage" Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, July 21, 2003

It's Unstable: Instability: Common usage keeps changing. The case of analog sound discs is a perfect example. The terms "record," "album," "LP," and "vinyl disc" have all been common usage at one time or another. To apply the criterion of common usage retrospectively would lead to an endless succession of changing terms for the same things, all of them leaving their traces in our descriptions. ALA feels rather strongly that common usage should not be used to justify such constant updating of established SMD terms. Once a term has been established for a particular type of carrier, based (among other factors) on common usage at the time, that term should not be changed. The fact that this term may not always be recognized by future users is perhaps an argument for applying the common usage criterion with extreme care in the first place.

Common usage has no bright line. My opponent needs to be showing a clear metric for determining when a word has met the threshold for common usage and is not merely used frequently.

Even if a word is more commonly used, that doesn't justify its preference; **common usage has no real impact** in the debate round. The resolution uses certain words and often we must pick a less common definition in order for the resolution to make grammatical sense. For example, a sanction is commonly referred to as an endorsement, but in terms of economic sanctions we must look to a less common usage of the word sanction, a prohibition.

Grammar good

While definitions, contextual or otherwise, can widely vary, the rules of grammar ensure that a purely grammatical sentence should express a **small number of potential meanings**. This means that evaluating the topic based on its syntax provides the most probable way of arriving at the “ideal” way the resolution should be interpreted. Even if my opponent claims that grammar is only a cultural construct created by power structures, we still use this construct in all communications, so the argument still applies. The resolution has codified rules that we can see if the resolution meets or doesn’t providing a clear bright line making the debate easily judicable and preventing judge intervention.

Grammar bad

4. The static notion that grammar should adjudicate what is topical and not topical is the very root of domination and colonization.

Cathbin Ayoob- 1999 [Majors in Speech Communications. She has been published previously in Handguns 1998 and 1999; Gunweek; Women and Guns; and Police Marksman. She holds a dean's scholarship and is also a member of the Burnet Park Zoo, and AWARE. Her interests include photography, Aikido, writing, and teaching. She wrote her essay for Vivian Rice's WRT 331.] "The Systematic Teaching of Grammar: A Critique" <http://wrt-intertext.syr.edu/VII/ayoob.html>.

In studying grammar, it is important to look at its origins. Where was the world before standardized grammar? The origins of grammar can lead one to reject the traditional teaching of grammar. The first book of grammar, Grammatica Castellana written by [a] Spaniard Elio Antoine de Nebrijia, was published [in] on August 19, 1492. This book was written because " the unbound and ungoverned speech in which people actually live and manage their lives has become a challenge to the Crown" (qtd. in Edlund 92). In essence grammatically standard language was created so that people would learn the same language and be easier to govern. If people do not understand what you are saying, then their communication cannot be ruled. (It is interesting to note that 1492 marks the beginning of colonization as we know it.) Columbus colonized Native Americans and Mexicans as other European explorers headed towards Africa and Asia.) Teaching traditional grammar rules as the one and only way to convey the English language creates oppressive ideals. If these rules propose that there is one perfect language, and language creates reality, then it can be understood that these rules assume one perfect reality. Standardized, unchanging grammar rules assume that there is only one accurate form of a language, and those who use are in control of the language are in control of society. These conceptual theories of the oppressive nature of grammar can be seen everywhere. Those who speak "perfect English" are at the top of our economic chain, i.e. politicians, business owners, [and] CEOs, and professors (I realize that educators are not at the top of the food chain, but they do shape the ideals of their students). Those who use slang, common English, Ebonics, what have you, are not in powerful positions in this society. Therefore proper, grammatical English is a hierarchical divider. James Baldwin writes: " People evolve a language in order to describe and thus control their circumstances, or in order not to be submerged by reality that they cannot articulate. It goes without saying, then, that language is also a political instrument, means, and proof of power" (40). Those who control language and the formation of language shape reality. Language is ever changing. New dialects emerge all the time. We are a country of many different origins, perhaps it is time to have a language rules that incorporate all of these origins.

Reject the debater here. We are humans before we are debaters, meaning if his act justifies harm to humans you reject him before you look at the rest of the flow. These impacts also outweigh fairness and education as they only impact to some conception of the good which oppression and colonization is much worse and actually affects people unlike a round. And even if this doesn't affect anything outside of the round, link turns to fairness as endorsing grammar empirically and logically leads to mass inequalities- meaning his own standard is endorsing unfairness. This is also un-educational, as we should only learn things that don't hurt people, or that undercuts the purpose of education. We could learn and be taught a lot of knowledge why racism is good but that would not be good education. Next, reject complicity – this is not a micro political argument- you're ballot is a question of who's discourse to endorse so even if I have zero solvency you have an

obligation to not endorse hurting humans. But voting him down creates a disincentive to run these arguments meaning we lessen oppressive ideas.

5. **Grammar can be disconnected from the way we actually speak in the real world.** Some people are ignorant of grammatical rules while others recognize the cultural necessity of adapting a syntactical form for an uncommon purpose. Therefore, using grammar as the primary mechanism to comprehend all communication could potentially lead to misunderstandings or misinformed extrapolations.
6. **Merely understanding grammar is insufficient to explain phrases that carry meaning beyond that of their constituent parts.** Analyzing the resolution's grammar as the primary mechanism for comprehending it leads to an unsophisticated understanding of the topic's nuances and does not adequately resolve the topicality debate.
7. **Grammatical rules do not intrinsically mean anything;** they are simply the result of the existing power structures at the time rules of language are created. While they may carry significance today, this significance does not necessarily reflect reason or rationality and may therefore be overridden by such concerns.
8. Grammatical rules serve to clarify writing to the point where it is comprehensible, but they **fail to set forth explicit rules** for conveying every possible type of information. This is why there is a difference between a writer who is merely grammatical and a writer who is considered talented; syntax alone is insufficient to depict any relatively complex idea.

Chapter 3: Scope

plan focus > Res focus

A. Interpretation

The affirmative may limit their advocacy to a topical plan with a solvency advocate.

B. Standards –

1. Real world decision-making

In the real world, policymakers and other rational agents can't implement general statements of value. Instead, they can only consider and implement specific plans of action that reflect these general statements. Real world decision-making has the strongest link to education because the ability to make decisions is the most important skill debaters gain from debate.

Paul Strait (George Mason University) and Brett Wallace explain (George Washington University). "The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making." WFU Debater's Research Guide. 2007. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key still. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends all boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

So, evaluate real world decision-making before any other claims to education.

2. Reciprocal burdens

Plan focus uniquely creates reciprocal burdens for the aff. and the neg. Comparing the relative advantages and disadvantages of a plan under the resolution gives aff. and neg. arguments equal weight. Under other interpretations, the aff. burden is significantly greater than the neg. burden and the neg. can use unequal strategies like counter-warrants to negate the res. Reciprocal burdens are key for fairness because they ensure that both debaters need to do the same amount of work to win. Reciprocal burdens are also key for education because they increase debate over substantive issues when one debater is more focused on trying to meet the burden than the other.

3. Aff flex.

Allowing the aff. flexibility to choose different strategies is important because it helps to mitigate the neg's automatic advantage, which is evidenced by time skew – the neg has more time to respond to the aff case and the aff has less time to cover both sides of the round, meaning that the aff is structurally at a disadvantage going into the round and therefore needs flexibility to compensate. Aff framework choice is necessary. O'Donnell explains:

"And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate". Timothy M. O'Donnell. Director of Debate. University of Mary Washington.

There are several reasons why the affirmative should get to choose the framework for the debate. First, AFC preserves the value of the first affirmative constructive speech. This speech is the starting point for the debate. It is a function of necessity. The debate must begin somewhere if it is to begin at all. Failure to grant AFC is a denial of the service rendered by the affirmative team's labor when they crafted this speech. Further, if the affirmative does not get to pick the starting point, the opening speech act is essentially rendered meaningless while the rest of the debate becomes a debate about what we should be debating about.

The aff deserves flexibility to establish the terms of debate because it would be more unfair to cost the aff six minutes of their speech time just because they have the misfortune of speaking first.

4. Depth of research – plan focus promotes depth of research by allowing affs to focus on specific policies, therefore giving them more opportunity to research and flesh out the implications of the plans they advocate. Advocating the entire resolution promotes shallow or generic research on many possible affirmative actions. Depth of research is key to education because a thorough knowledge of significant topics has educational value while superficial knowledge of a broad range of topics acquired through a res focus is less useful in and out of the round.

5. Argument quality - specification of the implementation process of a particular affirmative plan gives the negative specific ground to attack. Granting access to specific DA and turn ground increases the educational value of debate because direct clash arises by attacking the specific links of an affirmative plan rather than running entirely unrelated generic arguments. Argument quality is key to education as the arguments advanced in round determine what we learn from each debate. Moreover, we learn more from direct clash because it forces us to make strategic choices and weigh between different arguments.

Plan focus good frontlines

A2: Plans give aff better ground because they get to arbitrarily narrow the debate

- f. **Topicality Checks** this argument because if the aff advocacy is arbitrary and unpredictable then the negative can simply argue that the aff is non-topical, however, this is not a problem with plan focus as a whole
- g. **LINK Turn:** Plan focus **gives negatives better ground** because they can argue literally ANY advocacy outside of the plan, even topical advocacies, which is ground negs would not have access to absent plan focus
- h. **IMPACT Turn:** Allowing the aff to have flexibility is a good thing because this will **increase aff win percentage to compensate for neg time bias** and create a truly level playing field where affs win around fifty percent of the time. My opponent will attempt to say that there is no reason flexibility uniquely checks time bias however this is empirically denied because it has checked back neg time bias in policy debate as win percentage is relatively equal.

A2: Plan focus kills breadth

1. My opponent makes breadth claims however they do not show why breadth of discussion is uniquely important to fairness, they need to understand the **difference between breadth of research and breadth of discussion.**
2. Non-unique: Res focus discourages breadth of research because debaters only need to cut the generic **cards** that every one runs in order to write a stock aff, encouraging only surface level research.
3. Turn: It increases breadth of research because affs have an incentive to research several potential plans on the topic before writing one. Thus, because I am controlling uniqueness, I am straight turning breadth
4. IMPACT Turn: Breadth of discussion is uneducational because we **only learn a small amount about each issue** we discuss. Depth of discussion is more educational because we can actually obtain useful knowledge and new insight from in-depth discussions. This is similar to how it is more educational to read one five hundred page book than the first page of five hundred books
5. LINK Turn: Plan focus encourages negs to run a wide variety of arguments in response to the aff as they are granted topical counter plan ground and specific disadvantage ground which they would not have under res focus, so they are able to make **new types of arguments** increasing breadth of discussion.

AT: Plan Focus unpredictable

1. Aff. flexibility

Currently, negs. empirically win more than affs. due to the fact that they have a time advantage and under a resolution focus, it is easier to prove the resolution false, than true. Thus, we must prefer operating under a “unpredictable” plan focus, because even if it advantages the aff., in the end, it merely balances out the win ratio in the end.

2. Topicality checks

As long as I am within the bounds of the resolution the neg. should be able to prep it. If my plan is truly unpredictable AND gives me significantly better ground than my opponent, then it would be untopical, and he/she should have run topicality. Thus, plan focus isn’t actually unpredictable. Rather, untopical positions are, and T checks for that.

3. (Only if you disclose) Disclosure checks

I disclosed my position to my opponent before the round meaning they could have prepped positions specific to my advocacy. There is zero abuse here; if they knew it pre-round it can’t be unpredictable.

Solvency advocate checks

I can only run plans that are under the resolution and endorsed by a solvency advocate. Since, solvency advocates are based in the literature, this means that all plans must have literature about them, and thus can be predicted, and argued against. Because I have solvency advocate for my position, that only proves that my plan isn’t actually unpredictable, and that there are arguments.

Political relevance checks

Political relevance checks for unpredictability

Either

- A. There's no current events publications on an issue meaning there aren't big impacts because significant issues are politically relevant and are reflected as such in the news or
- B. It is politically relevant, and thus in current events publications meaning they could have easily predicted it. Thus, it is not the aff. who is being unpredictable, but rather the neg. not doing enough research.

K checks

K's can link regardless of me running a plan or defending the whole resolution. Thus, no matter how unpredictable I am, at the very least, the neg. can still run a K. This mitigates the impact of unpredictability as the neg. can still do research to substantively answer the plan.

Deontology (and other philosophy checks) – Generic philosophical arguments, especially deontology, which create categorical reasons to reject the resolution check predictability. So long as a philosophy creates a reason to reject the resolution in its entirety, it doesn't matter if the plan is unpredictable, as the NC will still substantively answer it. The inability to research an unpredictable position is mitigated by the ability to research categorically binding philosophies.

Generic Link Ground Checks

There are always generic arguments that will link to the resolution. Because plans will always fall under the resolution, there will always be arguments that can link to them. This checks back the harms of predictability as the neg. can still research positions which will answer the AC meaning that there is no advantage to the aff. having better prep for their arguments.

AT: Denies philosophy/value ground

1. Turn

Plan focus encourages values and philosophy debate as competitors are forced to research philosophically grounded positions. Since it's impossible to research every plan, philosophy is crucial to taking out multiple different advocacies. Res focus hurts values and philosophy ground as there is an incentive to run multiple counter-warrants instead of engaging in the philosophy debate, as it is impossible to answer 7 minutes of counter warrants in a 4 minute speech.

Turn

Plan focus actually makes philosophy more relevant because most of my aff is devoted to the plan instead of framework giving them a better ability to win the framework debate. And, philosophical frameworks are still very relevant with plan focus because impacts need always to be evaluated under some value structure. They get the same if not better philosophy ground.

Turn

Philosophy and values are only important if they can apply to the real world. Otherwise, it wouldn't make sense to run philosophical arguments as the resolution asks us to evaluate a real world action. Plan Focus therefore ensures better philosophy and values ground as plans reflect real world policy making. Non-plan affs might have a link to the real world, but this is just a possibility, whereas plan focus guarantees a link to the real world.

RESOLUTION IS A TOPIC AREA

The resolution indicates a general moral statement. The resolution does not indicate a course of action, but instead states whether a decision is moral. The fact that it does not specify an actor, action, and etc., inherently implies that it cannot be a plan, but rather serves as a general statement that encompasses over plans.

Almost all **topic literature** discusses specific examples within a topic; very few, if any, discuss the resolution as a complete statement. Topic literature is the most important standard in terms of fairness because learning how to research is the foundation of participating in academic debate, learning good educational practices, reading the opinions of many different people, and developing critical reading/thinking skills. Therefore, we must allow debaters use the resolution as a starting point and the literature as a basis for positions because it is the only way debaters have a competitive incentive to do research.

Checks back Neg bias. The neg has an advantage over me because of the literally infinite number of ways they can attack the resolution. To check this back, the aff should be able to treat the resolution as a topic area to preserve fairness. Furthermore, it allows for better education because we do what the topic literature asks, such that we actually can have a debate about the merits of the topic lit.

Res Focus > Plan Focus

- A) Interpretation: The neg advocacy must be the whole resolution
- B) Violation: The neg specifies a plan that is a portion of the resolution rather than the whole resolution.
- C) Standards:

Depth of issues – stock issues are complicated and can be delved into more than we have time for in a debate round. Having multiple rounds about the whole resolution and the same issues improves our understanding of those issues rounds at the last tournaments on a topic always go more in-depth than the beginning ones because the amount of rounds we have on a topic improves our depth of knowledge on that issue. This is an internal link to education because the depth that we understand the issues is the same as the depth of education we are getting.

Values Debate- LD resolutions are worded in a way that implies a value statement not a policy option. Plans take our focus away from the debate about the values and philosophy behind the resolution and focus it on the implementation or specific situations. The focus of the debate as implied by the resolution is education on the philosophical side of the issue if the focus is shifted from that topic specific education is hindered.

Switch side debate- Plan focus permits topical cps this discourages switch sides debate because it virtually allows people to affirm every round. This is bad for education because the critical thinking it takes to switch sides is key to the education we get from debate.

Link Ground - Plan focus destroys generic link ground because negatives must run specific arguments to contest the affirmative, which is unfair because the negative cannot utilize its prep whereas the aff can and uneducational because we do not learn about the fundamental questions of the resolution.

Fair division of ground - Affs can choose the best plans on the topic that are nearly uncontestable which is unfair because they get to pick the best ground and leave me with all the mediocre arguments on the topic. They may say that T checks but T does not say whether or not an aff can be strategic, rather it says whether or not we should prefer a given definition of a word so T can't check back the division of ground argument.

Topical counterplans bad

A. **Interpretation** – counterplans must exist partially or entirely outside the scope of the resolution

B. **Violation** - They run a topical counterplan.

C. **Standards** –

1. **Switch-sides debate** – when the neg runs a topical counterplan, they can use affirmative arguments when negating. Forcing counterplans to cover some ground outside the resolution stops negs from just using their affirmative cases for both sides. Switch-sides debate fosters education because

A. Learning to debate on two sides of an issue is an act of ethical education that debate uniquely teaches. Day explains:

Douglas G. Day, Assistant Professor and Director of Forensics at the University of Wisconsin, 1966
["The Ethics of Democratic Debate," *Central States Speech Journal*, Volume 17, February, p. //
BATMAN]

To present persuasively arguments for a position with which one disagrees is the highest ethical act in debate because it sets aside personal interests for the benefit of the common good. Essentially, for the person who accepts decision by debate, the ethics of the decision-making process are superior to the ethics of personal conviction on particular subjects for debate. Democracy is a commitment to means, not ends. Democratic society accepts certain ends, *i.e.*, decisions, because they have been arrived at by democratic means. We recognize the moral priority of decision by debate when we agree to be bound by that decision regardless of personal conviction. Such an agreement is morally acceptable because the decision-making process guarantees our moral integrity by guaranteeing the opportunity to debate for a reversal of the decision. Thus, personal conviction can have moral significance in social decision-making only so long as the integrity of debate is maintained. And the integrity of debate is maintained only when there is a full and forceful confrontation of arguments and evidence relevant to decision. When an argument is not presented or is not presented as persuasively as possible, then debate fails.

Switch-side debate destroys clash and respect for decision-making processes, harming the educational benefits of debate.

B. Switch-sides debate simply teaches debaters more about the topic than they could learn by just researching one side. When debaters must debate both sides, they must research a variety of arguments before formulating their case positions, which is a valuable skill taught by debate.

2. Effective clash – topical counterplans destroy effective clash by narrowing the difference in advocacies between both sides. Debate would then become an issue of trivial differences between the two advocacies rather than the substantive discussion of two contradictory policy options that it would become with a non-topical counterplan. Clash is key to education because it improves debaters' abilities to generate arguments and delineate important distinctions between different schools of thought.

Topical counterplans good

Interpretation

The neg. may run topical counterplans.

Standards

a. Real world decision making

Topical counterplans reflect how policy-makers go about choosing the plan to implement. Once policy-makers agree upon a common goal, they debate over which way is best to achieve the goal rather than present unrelated plans that do not forward the discussion of the achievement of the goal. Real world decision making has the strongest internal link to education.

The scope of negative fiat and the logic of decision making. L. Paul **Strait** George Mason University **and** Brett **Wallace Write:** George Washington University.

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. **The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning** like "policy education" and "kritik education," **it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain.** The implication for this analysis is that **the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them.** **It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives.** While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those **skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.**

This is also key to fairness because arguments that aren't grounded in the real world are unpredictable as they are fundamentally different, giving me a disadvantage by forcing me to run something that my everyday experience contradicts

b. Clash

Topical counterplans increase clash of arguments regarding of the actual implementation of the affirmative plan because the aff. is forced to defend why their solvency better achieves a goal than a similar plan would. If the negative could only run non-topical counterplans, the affirmative no longer has to weigh the strength different solvency evidence because the negative is claiming to solve for an entirely different harm.

Pics bad

Interpretation: Counter Plans must be entirely exclusive of the affirmative advocacy

Violation: My opponent runs a plan inclusive counterplan which includes part of the affirmative advocacy.

Standards

1. **Time skew:** PICs waste the 1AC speech time, because they render substantive advantages non-unique by focusing on a slight distinction. If the neg can agree with 99% of the aff, only 1% of my 6 minutes matters in the 1AR. Also, it explodes the effectiveness of Negative speech time because he can spend almost all of his time attacking the small portions of the AC that he doesn't agree with. Skewing time is unfair because the speech times are designed to give each debater an equal chance at winning the round; that's why both sides add up to 13 minutes. If I don't get an equal opportunity to speak, I don't have a fair chance at winning. Also, this standard doesn't just say he can't agree with any of my arguments, a PIC steals a huge portion of AFF ground and renders it useless. That's different from him conceding an argument or saying that one contention is non-unique.
2. **Turn Ground:** PICs steal key AFF turn ground because there is only a tiny section of the debate that separates the AFF from the NEG and I can't debate against my own advocacy. As such, there is only a minuscule piece of offense that the AFF can contest. This is a severe rupture of competitive equity because the AFF cannot generate reciprocal offense. Disads and plan exclusive CP's check opponent's ground loss, if they find a problem with a part of a plan they can run a DA or a plan exclusive counter plan not a PIC. Since ground is the only way to generate offense towards the ballot, destroying ground, prevents AFF ability to win the round.
3. **Predictability:** The PIC is unpredictable because they could PIC out of any part of the plan making it impossible to predict how my opponent will modify the aff advocacy. There is no way for me to prepare before round against the infinite number of minute modifications to the aff advocacy, making the round unfair because the negative will always be more prepared to defend the PIC than I will be to debate against it. This also destroys in round clash making the round highly uneducational as we do not actually engage each others' arguments. Additionally, focusing on only a portion of the plan destroys our learning because we never test the merits of the actual plan but a small portion, destroying education.

Impacts: Fairness and education

PICs Good

Interpretation – the neg may run one PIC that excludes a word or phrase in the resolution and has a solvency advocate.

I meet – I exclude _____ and my _____ card advocates the PIC

Standards

Key to fairness – PICs are a necessary part of a critical neg strategy against the vague resolution – otherwise it can be claimed that the resolution captures the CP. Failure to allow us this kills fairness by making it impossible for the neg to win and kills education by making clash on CPs impossible

Strategic choice – PICs force the aff to affirm all parts of the resolution and defend all parts. This is good for education by increasing the critical thinking and increases fairness by having the aff affirm all parts, and the neg negate it.

Real World Decision Making -Debate is only a valuable activity if we use it as a means to making informed decisions. The benefits we derive from debate are those which can apply outside of debate, most notably our ability to make informed choices. Therefore, we ought to value arguments which correspond to real world decision making. My opponent's interpretation prevents real world decision making as when legislators propose policy decisions, they evaluate such policies with the goal of achieving the best outcome. PIC's do this by advocating for the best policy, even if this policy only slightly differs with the plan. Real world decision making is key to education as our educational benefits are derived from how we use debate out of round. Strait and Wallace explain why real world decision making has the strongest link to education

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. **The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning** like "policy education" and "kritik education," **it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain.** The implication for this analysis is that **the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives.** While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those **skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.**

Chapter 4: Status

conditionality bad

A. **Interpretation** – counterplans must either be unconditional or dispositional.

B. **Violation** – they run a conditional counterplan.

C. **Standards** –

1. **Strat skew** – if I answer the counterplan sufficiently by generating good responses then they can just kick it and generate offense in other ways, but if I don't answer it sufficiently then they can go for it and I no longer have a way to generate responses against it. I can't develop a coherent strategy because I can't predict what they will go for in his next speech, and my strategy is premised upon what arguments I think they will go for. The ability to develop a strategy is key to fairness because strategy determines how we make arguments that will win us the round, and the neg strategy prevents me from doing this. It is also key to education because strategy generates good argumentation, forcing debaters to engage in better critical thinking and communication in order to win.

2. **Effective clash** – the neg justifies never engaging in NC arguments because he can just kick out of my responses in the NR. This means that we can never have effective clash. Clash involves comparative debate and contestation over arguments, so it promotes critical thinking and argumentation skills and therefore increases education. Moreover, clash promotes a more in-depth discussion that will increase our understanding of the topic, therefore generating topic-specific education.

3. **Reciprocal risk balance** – conditionality creates a no-risk issue for the neg, since the neg can just kick the counterplan as soon as I generate any offense on it. Since I can't kick out of affirming, generic neg disads and turns will always be effective and the risk balance in the round is skewed. A reciprocal risk balance is key to fairness because strategy is constrained by potential risks. If one side has more no-risk issues than the other, this places that side at an unfair advantage.

4. **Argument quality** – conditionality justifies irresponsible neg argumentation because negs can run multiple counterplans that contradict or bad arguments that they don't plan on going for in the NR. Because the neg can just kick out of these arguments, they never receive the deterrent effect generated by good responses to bad arguments. Conditionality harms education because debaters learn by seeing how others respond to their positions, but conditionality encourages negs to ignore those arguments because they have no impacts on individual rounds.

conditionality good

1. Interpretation

The neg. may run unconditional counterplans

2. Standards

a. Real world decision making

Policy makers aren't bound to a plan if they see there are other better ones. Conditional counter-plans are also key to testing the desirability of the aff- if I cant kick a counter-plan I am deterred

from running it because of the opportunity cost, meaning we never get the education of finding the best policy option and the way that policy makers offer multiple plans but end up only voting for one of them. And real world decision making is key to education.

The scope of negative fiat and the logic of decision making. L. Paul Strait George Mason University and Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

This is also key to fairness because arguments that aren't grounded in the real world are unpredictable as they are fundamentally different, giving me a disadvantage by forcing me to run something that my everyday experience contradicts.

b. Offsets the Affs. Plan Choice:

By giving the negative the ability to keep an argument at any time it offsets the unfairness created by the aff. choosing the plan ground. This choice is unfair because the choice of plans severely limits the neg. counter-plan ground so by giving them the ability to drop arguments we are reopening some of the negs. counterplan ground that would otherwise be inaccessible. This not only is key to fairness but also adds educational value to the debate because there are more counterplans being run meaning we learn more in any given debate.

c. Critical Thinking

This spurs critical thinking because the AFF has to create the optimal strategy to compensate for the conditional CP. This fulfills the role of debate, instructing people how to think, by challenging the AFF and not allowing them an easy road to the ballot.

d. Neg. Flex

Conditional CP are key to neg. flex because the aff. has an inherent advantage by not only framing the round by speaking first but by speaking last. Eliminating a key component of the neg. strategy would create unfair debate by allowing the AFF access to structural advantages that the neg. cannot overcome.

e. Reciprocity

The aff. is allowed to have access to a policy option, therefore the neg. should be too. The aff. can kick the AC and go for offense elsewhere in the round, the neg. should have that same ability. The

aff. can make multiple perms as well, creating different advocacies and then only go for one of them. Conditional CP solve for this by allowing the neg. the same ability to test whether or not their advocacy functions as a net benefit. To create un-reciprocal burdens would lead to a disadvantage for one side, destroying the competitive equity of debate.

f. Depth of discussion

Allowing negs. to kick one or more of the counter plans allows an in depth discussion about the other(s) or the status quo, which is a more educational discussion to have because it probably involves the best alternative policy option to the aff. advocacy. Depth of discussion in general is key to education because the only way we learn in debate rounds themselves is by exploring the issues over which we debate with thorough discourse that gives us insight about new facets of a given issue on the topic.

g. Breadth of research

Allowing negs. to run conditional counter plans encourages negs. to run more counter plans as they are no-risk. This increases breadth of research because negs. must research more viable policy alternatives to common affirmatives if it is more strategic to run multiple counter plans, which gives us new insight and knowledge about different stances on the topic as well as alternatives in the topic literature, so it promotes education.

dispositionality bad

Interp: All negative counter plans must be unconditional

Violation: The negative counter plan is dispositional

Standards:

A: Stable Advocacy: Because dispositionality inevitably results in unspecified conditions for when one must advocate or is permitted to kick the counter plan this results in advocacy shifts in the 2NR during which negatives will be able to say that there was an unspecified condition or a condition related to something stated in cross-ex such as saying that a straight turn is effectively a perm so the can kick the straight turned CP which completely disadvantages the aff who had just responded to the CP in a way in which they assumed the neg must advocate it, which 1: takes away offense from the aff that the aff may have gone for in the 2AR and 2: takes away aff time spent answering the CP, giving the negative more time to make relevant arguments and win the round, offsetting fairness.

B: Division of ground: The neg gets to literally choose when they can kick the CP, there is no reason why they have to advocate it which means that they can choose the best possible status of the counter plan according to when it would be strategic to kick it or advocate it, destroying fairness because affs cannot pick and choose between their aff and other advocacies when it may be strategic to do so yet the negative has this strategic option, giving the negative a structural disadvantage over the aff.

C. **Real World Decision Making:** In the real world, modern policy makers are not bound to the plan they are currently advocating and if they want to, they can drop it and go for a new plan. This is key to fairness because it gives the negative the ability to make a counterplan without being forced to keep it. Also it gives educational value to the debate because if they were not able to drop it, they would most likely go for safer arguments which would prevent us from learning through these unique plans.

D. **Offsets the Aff's Plan Choice:** By giving the negative the ability to keep an argument at any time it offsets the unfairness created by the aff choosing the plan ground. This choice is unfair because the choice of plans severely limits the neg counter-plan ground so by giving them the ability to drop arguments we are reopening some of the negs counterplan ground that would otherwise be unaccesible. This not only is key to fairness but also adds educational value to the debate because there are more counterplans being run meaning we learn more in any given debate.

Dispositionality Good

Counter Interpretation - The neg may run dispositional counterplans in which they can kick it if the aff places a piece of defense on the net benefit, attempts to perm, or place a no solvency argument on the CP.

I Meet - My counterplan is dispositional with clear limits as to when it can be kicked.

Standards -

1. **Strategy skew.** Conditional counterplans can be dropped at anytime throughout the debate while I give you certain conditions under which these counter plan(s) can be kicked. Therefore I am not skewing your strategy because you now know the conditions under which I must be in, in order to kick the counter plan. Therefore you can try to make sure that I will not go into one of the circumstances in which I can kick the counter plan. This is a good link to education because it tests how to deal with delicate issues that could become problematic when not handled well. This is key to fairness because it gives the affirmative the terms under which the counter plan(s) can be kicked instead of kicking the counter plan arbitrarily.
2. **Predictable** - Dispositionality sets limits for when the negative can and cannot kick the counterplan. This means that it is fair in the debate because the affirmative knows exactly when the neg will kick it.
3. **Reasonable flexibility** - The negative is given flexibility within the round the round reasonably. This means that dispositionality is not going to be unfair to the affirmative because there will never be a situation in which the negative can unreasonably kick and argument. Also this is fair to the negative because the affirmative got to choose the ground (with the plan) and so it is only fair the negative has some flexibility within his/her counterplan.

Limited Conditionality Bad

A) Interpretation - if the neg runs a counterplan, then it must be either unconditional or dispositional.

B) Violation - they are running a limited conditional counterplan.

C) Standards –

1) **Strat skew** – my opponent can kick the counterplan at virtually any time, thus rendering the arguments I place on it irrelevant. This means that I can never even gain some conception of the impacts my arguments will have upon the round, whereas if they run an unconditional/or dispositional counterplan then I can gain a good idea of how my arguments will alter their strategic decisions. Debaters must have an equal ability to weigh the benefits of making arguments against the time spent making those arguments in order to have a fair shot at accessing the ballot

2) **Reciprocal impact ground** – my opponent has access to the world of the counterplan and the world of the status quo, while I only have access to the aff world. If the neg is forced to run an unconditional counterplan then we are both defending one potential world/, and if the neg runs a dispositional counterplan, I can at least formulate a strategy that will tie the neg to one world or the other. Reciprocal impact ground is key to fairness because impacts are how debaters generate offense; if my opponent can generate offense from two worlds while I can only generate offense from one, this puts me at a disadvantage.

3) **Reciprocity** – any reciprocity arguments are false, I can't kick my advocacy in the face of straight turns, but the neg can. This kills fairness because it does not place the same standard of burdens on the neg as it does the aff.

4) **Kills clash** – this allows them to kick the CP as soon as I read answers on it – kills fairness because of a massive time skew and kills education because it disables clash on the flow.

5) **Dispo solves all offense** - Places them in double bind, either the CP is predictable, such that perms would not be required and straight turns would check abuse, or the CP is unpredictable which forces perms which are the only way I can get back to ground zero.

limited conditionality good

- A. Interpretation – the neg may run a limited conditional counterplan.
- B. Violation – the aff says that I must run an unconditional counterplan/ a dispositional counterplan.
- C. Standards –

1. Real world decision-making – limited conditionality is most consistent with the way everyone makes decisions in the real world. Roger Solt writes:

(Solt, Roger. "The Disposition of Counterplans and Permutations: The case for Logical, Limited Conditionality." Mental Health Policies: Escape from Bedlam? 2003)

According to this approach, **the counterplan is always at the negative's disposition in that they can always concede the counterplan and defend the status quo**, even if the affirmative has only attacked its desirability, that is, they have straight turned the counterplan. The first argument in favor of this position is that it follows from the logic of real world decision-making. **A rational decision-maker, confronted with two proposals for change, can almost always reject both and keep things as they are, and indeed, s/he should do so if both changes would be inferior to the policy that now exists.**

Forcing me to run an unconditional counterplan is completely non-reflective of the way people actually make decisions, as no one is completely pinned to their advocacy in the light of the status quo. Dispositionalism is also not reflective of these processes, as my reason for preferring the status quo would not hinge upon the types of arguments my opponents made against it. Real world decision-making is key to education because one of the most important skills we get out of debate is how to use argumentation to arrive at decisions in general, not just in the context of rounds.

2. Real-world advocacy – limited conditionality is most consistent with the way policy advocates make decisions in the real world. Roger Solt writes:

(Solt, Roger. "The Disposition of Counterplans and Permutations: The case for Logical, Limited Conditionality." Mental Health Policies: Escape from Bedlam? 2003)

Faced with one proposal for change, opponents of a policy frequently offer a counter-proposal. In response to the Republican tax cut proposal, the Democrats will offer an alternative tax cut proposal of their own. But even if the Democrats' plan is rejected, the Republicans' need not be embraced. Democrats can still vote against the Republican plan. Indeed, this posture of **proposing an alternative, but still defending the status quo as superior to the policy proposed by one's political opponents is so common** that it is essentially business as usual. **Thus, rejecting all forms of conditional argument is in fact less in accord with the practice of real world public advocates than is the acceptance of limited conditionality.**

Since we are discussing some kind of plan, we are trying to mimic the policymaking decisions expressed by real-world policymakers. Forcing me to be unconditional or dispositional does not respect the fact that neither of these options reflect how policymakers arrive at their decisions. Mirroring real-world advocacy increases education by letting us better comprehend political processes and therefore make informed political decisions.

3. Reciprocal strategy – limited conditionality fosters negative strategy by mirroring the affirmative strategy to “do both.” Roger Solt writes:

(Solt, Roger. “The Disposition of Counterplans and Permutations: The case for Logical, Limited Conditionality.” Mental Health Policies: Escape from Bedlam? 2003)

If a rational decision-maker were confronted with two mutually compatible and simultaneously desirable policies, s/he would presumably embrace both.

Likewise, if the judge is modeling the behavior of a rational, real world decision-maker, s/he should be able to simultaneously endorse both plan and counterplan, if the two taken together constitute the best policy option. Similarly, s/he should be able to endorse the option to “do neither,” since this option equally well follows from the logic of rational, real world decision-making. One could even regard the “do neither” option as a kind of negative permutation of plan and counterplan.

In the world of the violation, affs can still perm neg counterplans by removing neg uniqueness, so allowing negs to run limited conditional counterplans serves to create reciprocal strategy options for both sides. Reciprocal strategy is key to fairness because if one side inherently has more opportunity to access the ballot then this puts the other side at a permanent disadvantage.

4. Shifting advocacy – limited conditionality is simply a response to the aff’s indictment of the status quo in the 1AC, therefore preventing the aff from shifting advocacies by claiming not to have to defend their stance later. Roger Solt writes:

(Solt, Roger. “The Disposition of Counterplans and Permutations: The case for Logical, Limited Conditionality.” Mental Health Policies: Escape from Bedlam? 2003)

The affirmative has already had the whole 1AC to indict the status quo; thus, the status quo has already been subject to reasonably in depth discussion.

Disadvantages commonly establish their uniqueness relative to the status quo. The affirmative's initial advocacy is that the plan is superior to the status quo. **Not requiring that the affirmative successfully sustain this claim at the end of the round lets them shift their fundamental advocacy stance. Consistent advocacy on the part of the affirmative logically requires them to win both that their plan is superior to the status quo and that their plan (or a permutation) is superior to the counterplan.**

If the neg is not allowed to revert to defending the status quo at any point in the round, this is fundamentally unfair because debating the status quo was a parameter established by the aff. The aff therefore will not have a consistent advocacy. Shifting advocacies are unfair because they prevent me from formulating an in-round strategy that could enable me to win the round.

5. Reciprocal strategy – limited conditionality creates reciprocal strategies because it provides the neg with an equivalent strategic tool to the aff’s ability to perm counterplans, since I can choose to do neither advocacy and accept the status quo. Giving the aff the strategic option of doing both the plan and the counterplan is not reciprocal if I do not have the option of doing neither the plan nor the counterplan, since this would negate the aff’s perm. Reciprocal strategy is key to fairness since debaters use strategic options to shape their responses and research, so strategy constrains their abilities to generate offense.

Reciprocal strategy also generates clash since both sides still have different advocacies to argue over, improving the quality of argumentation and giving debaters more opportunity to practice communication skills.

D.

Chapter 5: Counterplans and fiat

Negative Fiat Good

A. Interpretation: The Neg may fiat an action when it is competitive with affirming.

B. I meet.

C. Standardss:

1. Real World Decision Making: Neg fiat promotes real world decision-making because when making decisions, policymakers and people in general are never constrained to the status quo. It's ridiculous to say that we only consider one plan alone. We construct multiple potential plans or counterplans whenever we act because we search for the best policy option not the first that comes to mind. Real world decision-making is key to education because it is the most important skill we can gain from the activity.

Paul Strait (George Mason University) and Brett Wallace explain (George Washington University). "The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making." WFU Debater's Research Guide. 2007.

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key still. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends all boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

2. Counterplan Ground: If the negative is not allowed to fiat an action, I lose access to counterplan ground because the negative can no longer discuss the impacts of another action being taken. Counterplan ground is key to fairness because counterplans constitute a massive amount of negative ground because they consist of all possible actions taken by another international, foreign, private actor or by multiple actors, or the number of different course of actions the specified agent can take. Counterplan ground is key to fairness because it is impossible for the negative to show the benefits of negating if they are forced to defend the status quo alone. The entire purpose of the affirmative is to prove that a plan that improves the status quo, so advocating the quo itself will never be net advantageous because the problems the aff claims solvency for

will remain unresolved in the neg world. Counterplan ground also fosters education because it allows us to determine the opportunity cost of the resolution by setting forth a next-best alternative. Determining opportunity costs is an important way to generate discussion and strategic thinking.

3. Reciprocity: Because the affirmative may fiat an action, the negative must be allowed to do the same. The ability to fiat allows the aff to assume their actions have 100% probability of coming true. Without fiat, there would be practically no chance that the negative would win because they have to prove both the solvency of their counterplan and the likelihood the counterplan would be implemented in the real world. Reciprocal burdens are key to fairness because without them both debaters don't have the same abilities to win the round. Reciprocity of both sides being allowed to fiat is key to education because both sides being able to assume fiat would increase the educational clash about the benefits of the plans themselves rather than require quibbling over the probability of the neg counterplan occurring.

ALTERNATIVE AGENT FIAT BAD

A. Interpretation: The negative can only fiat actors in the affirmative advocacy.

B. Violation: Their counterplan is executed by _____.

C. Standards:

1. Real World decision making

- a. When deciding between different policies, the major consideration policy-makers must have in mind is which actor is taking the action. The realm of possible choices is limited by which actor is taking the action and thus what they are capable of doing.

L. Paul **Strait** (George Mason University) **and** Brett **Wallace** (George Washington University). "The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making." WFU Debater's Research Guide. 2007.

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/2007/The%20Scope%20of%20Negative%20Fiat%20and%20the%20Logic%20of%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

The way in which decisions are made in the real world always takes into account the consideration of who is making the decision. Decision-makers can only choose from the available options open to them, and not from all possible options they can think of. While decision-making would be a lot easier if we could assume the position of a universal decision makers, i.e someone who is all powerful and can magically alter the course of action of anyone in the world they wanted, reality doesn't offer this option. There is no game genie for decision-making, no cheat code, and no ability to play god. Only once we realize the limited power that humans possess can we develop a cogent basis for decision-making.

Thus both debaters must be required to defend the same actor so the debate will be specific to the possibilities of actions taken by *one* actor, which is how decisions are actually made.

- b. Real world decision makers must take into account the probability of the action being taken in order to decide if that is the best policy to pursue. Because an actor has no full control over any actor other than itself, it can never have a guarantee that another agent will act accordingly. The neg fails to take into account the evaluation of the probability of policies being implemented, a key aspect necessary in decision-making is lost. **Strait** and **Wallace Two** continue:

L. Paul Strait (George Mason University) and Brett Wallace (George Washington University). “The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making.” WFU Debater’s Research Guide. 2007.

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/2007/The%20Scope%20of%20Negative%20Fiat%20and%20the%20Logic%20of%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

Since the entire point of fiat is to bracket off questions of “would” in order to focus completely on questions of “should,” questions of probability never get discussed. From the perspective of the agent identified in the plan, the probability is 100%, since if they decide to adopt the mandates of the plan, there is an absolute guarantee that they will in fact do so. Yet if the plan is compared to a counterplan in which Japan carries out public health assistance rather than the United States, there is never a situation where the United States could make a decision based on a 100% probability that Japan would take action if the United States did not. Thus, if the Congress had to consider if they should take action or some other decision-making body should take action, if they failed to consider the chance that that other decision-making body would not in fact take the desired action, they would not have gone through any sort of logical deliberation process.

c. Realistic decision making has the largest link to education

L. Paul Strait (George Mason University) and Brett Wallace (George Washington University). “The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making.” WFU Debater’s Research Guide. 2007.

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/2007/The%20Scope%20of%20Negative%20Fiat%20and%20the%20Logic%20of%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key still. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends all boundaries between categories of learning like “policy education” and “kritik education,” it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

2. Fiat Abuse – Alternative agent fiat is unfair as it allows the negative to wish away all harms and adjust its world to perfection. The negative no longer has a burden of solvency, and thus the affirmative can never win offense off solving a problem because the negative can effectively argue that those problems do not even exist in the first place in the neg world.

Straight and Wallace write,

Paul Strait [GMU] and Brett Wallace [GWU]. “The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making.” WFU Debater’s Research Guide. 2007.
<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/2007/The%20Scope%20of%20Negative%20Fiat%20and%20the%20Logic%20of%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

An examination of the question officiating “the object” makes our position even more clear. Except for those who believe in ‘negative flexibility’ as a cult-like religion, everyone agrees that **the negative should not be able to fiat the object of the plan; otherwise their win**

percentage would skyrocket at the expense of the affirmative. Imagine you are running an affirmative which gives condoms and educational assistance in order to solve an HIV/AIDS advantage. What substantive answer would you have to a counterplan that had all people infected with HIV become celibate? Or **suppose your plan was designed to solve a genocide. The counterplan to have the culpable government cease killing people probably solves your affirmative better than you could ever hope to with the plan. These are intuitively unfair, making it impossible for the affirmative to generate offense.** But what if we would adopt to preclude their discussion? Perhaps the negative should not be able to fiat a decision-maker who is affected by the plan. Even if there was some non-arbitrary way to decide what and who the plan affects, it is unclear if even that will be sufficient. Consider affirmatives which argue that the World Health Organization is making something worse, perhaps by offering defective medicine or equipment, and so the plan has the United States increase public health assistance in order to offset the poor assistance in the status quo. The counterplan to have the WHO change its policy solves the whole case, and the plan does not actually affect the WHO (the object of the plan is still some- where in sub-Saharan Africa), so our previously identified mle is insufficient forecluding this counterplan, yet it is also intuitively unfair. **When alternative agent fiat is allowed, there really is no non-arbitrary method of preventing object fiat. Since every harm area is a consequence of one's not solving it, every alternative agent counterplan is at least a little bit object fiat. While some counterplans are clearly "'more unfair' than others, if we can agree with the general principle that object fiat harms competitive equity, the only true solution is to prevent all alternative agent fiat.**

3. [only read when Res specifies the actor] **Reciprocal research burdens** – alternative agent fiat explodes the aff research burden since the aff must now research all agents who could potentially take the resolutinal action. Because the neg knows the aff is constrained to the resolutinal actor, they just have to research action by one agent, creating a significantly smaller research burden. Reciprocal research burdens are key to fairness because research is how we generate argumentation to win rounds; thus, if one side automatically has an easier research job, then that side is placed at an unfair advantage.

4. [only read when Res specifies the actor] **Reciprocal impact ground** – the aff is constrained to the benefits gained by the resolutinal actor enacting the resolution, while the neg could pick any actor that could garner them greater benefits than the resolutinal actor. This is fundamentally unfair because the aff has to advocate policy by the resolutinal actor. As a result, the neg is placed at an advantage by being able to choose an actor who always generates advantages compared to the aff's actor. Holding the neg to counterplans executed by the resolutinal actor, eliminates that advantage. Reciprocal impact ground is key to fairness because impacts are offense that ultimately determine who won or lost, so if one side can selectively pick better impact ground then that side is given an unfair advantage.

Alternative Agent Fiat GOOD

A. Counterinterpretation: the negative may fiat a different actor than the affirmative advocacy with a solvency advocate

B . I meet

C. Standards:

1. **Neg flexibility** – The affirmative has the advantage of picking the plan for the debate and thus establishing the basis for the central argumentation of the round. Thus the affirmative has a substantial advantage going into the round because they get to introduce an interpretation of the resolution that uniquely advantages them alone. Thus the negative needs to check back the affirmatives ability to skew the affirmative advantage by having the ability to adjust to and beat back any of the countless possible affirmatives. Neg flexibility is thus key to fairness because it balances the offset of competitive equity created by the affirmative's ability to establish the grounds of the debate.
2. **Disad ground.** The aff gets more disad ground when I run an alt agent counterplan since they can indict the specific actor, thus running DA's regarding the politics, implementation, backlash etc. This means the aff gets more ability to leverage offense against a counterplan which is necessary since the counterplan is probably solving back a portion of the AC offense. Equitable ground is key to fairness because ground is the basis for making arguments that win the round. DA ground is also key to education because it forces debaters to address eachother's warrants because DA's can NOT be ignored for the counterplan to still have significance in the round because extension of the counterplan extends the DA as well. Furthermore critical thinking and argument comparison is required to weigh the benefits of a plan against its potential disadvantages, a key educational skill encouraged by debate.
3. **Check on aff fiat** – alternative agent fiat checks aff fiat because it prevents the aff from :
 - A. making generic arguments that aren't specific to the resolutinal actor
 - B. making arguments that the resolutinal actor is capable of much more than it actually is.Alternative agent fiat presents a well-researched alternative that can demonstrate excessive or logically flawed aff fiat. Checking aff fiat is key to fairness because when the aff is allowed to invest its actor with the power to solve disadvantages to affirming, this places the neg at an unfair disadvantage because their ability to generate offense off the affirmative is destroyed. Checking aff fiat is also key to education because it grounds the debate in the real world, so the discussions generated by rounds are important to our life knowledge and not just to individual debate topics.
4. **Overlimiting:** Forcing the negative to defend a particular agent overlimits the ground available to the negative because I lose access to counterplans fiatting actions taken by foreign governments, foreign organizations, international organizations, private organizations, individuals, more specific subsets of the actor defended by the aff (i.e. the use of the US supreme court rather than congress), etc. The negative is entitled to this ground because the negative's burden is to prove the affirmative advocacy undesirable through explicit or opportunity costs. Severing negative access to key counterplan ground is unfair because the negative loses at least half of its ground because it no longer can effectively explain an opportunity cost of the plan because it can no longer defend these counterplans. Alt agent counterplan ground is key to education because they allow us to discuss a variety of different actors and develop an understanding of capacity of another agent's action which thereby gives rise to knowledge about how other agents function in the real world.

5. **Real world decision-making:** When policy makers decide how to resolve a particular problem, they decide on the option that solves most effectively. If an alternative agent has the capacity to execute the same policy in a far more effective manner, the agent's policy makers would not take the action because it would prevent an alternative agent from taking better measures to solve. Even if there is not a 100% probability that the other actor will take the action, an agent would not decide to implement their less effective version of a policy because then there is a 100% probability that a better option will never be implemented, while awaiting another actor's policy still leaves a high probability of the enactment of the significantly better policy. Thus considering alternative agent's action resembles real world-decision making while evaluating policies solely in terms of the available options of a single agent is unrealistically myopic. Real world decision making has the strongest link to education. **Strait and Wallace** explain:

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decisions to join the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern is finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. **The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing.** **Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories of learning** like "policy education" and "kritik education," **it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain.** The implication for this analysis is that **the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives.** While policy comparison **skills** are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills **are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.**

Multi-actor fiat bad

A: Interpretation- The affirmative must defend an action taken by a single sovereign nation state

B: Violation- my opponent's advocacy requires multiple actors to take an action

C: Standards

1. Real world decision making: Multiple actor fiat allows the negative to assume the implementation of a policy that in reality has an incredibly low chance of ever being passed. This is unique to multiple actor fiat because:

1. Their difference in priorities and ideologies prevent them from coming to a consensus of the ultimate goal in pursuit.
2. Their fundamental differences also prevent them from agreeing how to implement a plan.
3. Having multiple actors increases the likelihood of failure of the plan because miscommunication and disagreements render the plan infeasible.

The aff fails to take into account the evaluation of the probability of policies being implemented. Thus a key aspect necessary in decision-making is lost because when deciding whether there is a significant opportunity cost to an action the probability of the next best option must be taken into consideration. **Strait and Wallace:**

Consider what it means **when a judge votes affirmative or negative**. Supposing the affirmative has presented a topical plan, the judge votes affirmative when the plan is shown to be net-advantageous when compared to the status quo or a competitive alternative; and the judge votes negative when the plan is shown to be less desirable than the status quo or a competitive alternative. If giving testimony to the Congress, the judge **[they] could reasonably say: "based on the arguments I have heard** over the last hour and a half, **it would be better for you to do X than Y.**" In other words, after the debate is concluded, one entity could make a decision based on the information presented. This is not to say that Congress (or anyone else) should make decisions based on the outcomes of scholastic debate rounds—what is important is that **the debaters will have gone through the process of making an informed decision. This is** utterly **impossible if the negative supports action from some other agent**

besides the one identified in the plan. Since the entire point of fiat is to bracket off questions of "would" in order to focus completely on questions of "should," questions of probability never get discussed. **From the perspective of the agent** identified **in the plan**, the probability is 100%, since **if they decide to adopt the** mandates of the **plan, there is an absolute guarantee that they will** in fact **do so.** Yet if the plan is **compared to a counterplan in which Japan [is the actor]** carries out public health assistance **rather than the United States, there is never a situation where the United States could make a decision based on 100% probability that Japan would take action if the United States did not.** Thus, **[If the Congress had to consider if they should take action or some other decision-making body should take action, if they failed to consider the chance that the other decision-making body would not** in fact **take the** desired **action, they would not have gone through any** sort of **logical deliberation** process. Yet this is exactly the way proponents of alternative agent fiat encourage debaters to think.

Thus policy makers do not rely upon the implementation of another plan without taking into consideration the probability of that other plan being passed.

Real-world decision-making is the only standard that matters in the context of debate. Strait and Wallace Three explain:

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decisions to join the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern is finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

2. Fiat abuse: Assuming that multiple actors will agree to a policy allows for the negative to wish away problems of existing tensions between different actors that would prevent them from agreeing upon a policy in the real world. This form of fiat is abusive because it eliminates tensions that prevent the status quo from solving the problem by itself, thus constituting as a form of object fiat because the neg is willing away the problem of the resolution rather than proposing a way to solve it. Strait and Wallace:

An examination of the question of fiatting "the object" makes our position even more clear. Except for those who believe in 'negative flexibility' as a cult-like religion, everyone agrees that the negative should not be able to fiat the object of the plan; otherwise their win percentage would skyrocket at the expense of the affirmative. Imagine you are running an affirmative which gives condoms and educational assistance in order to solve an HIV/AIDS advantage. What substantive answer would you have to a counterplan that had all people infected with HIV become celibate? Or suppose your plan was designed to solve a genocide. The counterplan to have the culpable government cease killing people probably solves your affirmative better than you could ever hope to with the plan. These counterplans are intuitively unfair, making it impossible for the affirmative to generate offense. But what rule would we adopt to preclude their discussion? Perhaps the negative should not be able to fiat a decision-maker who is affected by the plan. Even if there was some non-arbitrary way to decide what and who the plan affects, it is unclear if even that rule would be sufficient. Consider affirmatives which argue that the World Health Organization is making something worse, perhaps by offering defective medicine or equipment and so the plan has the United States increase public health assistance in order to offset the poor assistance in the status quo. The counterplan to have the WHO (the object of the plan is still somewhere in sub-Saharan Africa), so our previously identified rule is insufficient for excluding this counterplan, yet it is also intuitively unfair. When alternative agent fiat is allowed, there really is no non-arbitrary method of preventing object fiat. Since every harm area is a consequence of no one's solving it, every alternative agent counterplan is at least a little bit object fiat. While some counterplans are clearly "more unfair" than others, if we can agree with the general principle that object fiat harms competitive equity, the only true solution is to prevent all alternative agent fiat.

3. under limiting: Giving the negative the ability to defend an action taken by multiple actors fiat gives them almost infinite amount of ground. There are so many actors that there are so many advocacies the negative can choose from to attack the affirmative. The fact that the negative is also not bound by topicality exacerbates the problem. Limiting ground is key to fairness because the negative has so much more ground to base their arguments that they can have many advocacies on file and simply read the one that the opponent will not be able to answer. Limits on ground is to education because running an advocacy that the opponent did not refer to would lower the amount of clash which is key to education.

Multi-actor fiat good

A: Interpretation- the neg may advocate actions enacted by multiple agents.

B: Violation- I meet

C: Standards-

- 1. Real world applicability:** With the dramatically increased interdependency of the globalized community today, unilateral action is less common because all nations share similar concerns.

Nussbaum warrants:

Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. Martha Nussbaum.

<http://faculty.capebretonu.ca/philosophy/301/pdfs/1%20Patriotism.pdf>

The air does not obey national boundaries. This simple fact can be, for children, the beginning of the recognition that, like it or not, we live in a world in which the destinies of nations are closely intertwined with respect to basic goods and survival itself. The pollution of third-world nations who are attempting to attain our high standard of living will, in some cases, end up in our air. No matter what account of these matters we will finally adopt, any intelligent deliberation about ecology -- as, also, about the food supply and population -- requires global planning, global knowledge, and the recognition of a shared future.

Thus unified actions taken by multiple actors are most reflective of the real world because nations work together to achieve their shared goals. The interdependency of nations limits the efficacy and frequency of unilateral action. Real world applicability is key to fairness because it provides the most predictable basis of pre-round knowledge. We can only use knowledge of circumstances we know exist in the real world in round. Thus acting in accordance to how the world functions is the most predictable. Predictability is key to fairness because one debater is unfairly advantaged if they have knowledge about the round that the other debater does not.

2. Topic Literature: Severing neg access to arguments referring to multiple actors severs me from critical and prevalent topic literature. My opponent's interpretation renders topic literature about treaties, decisions established at international conferences, alliances etc. that discuss such action useless. This particular topic literature is key to education because it develops debater's understanding of international relations, substantive education that will be critical and applicable in the real world because the internal arena has a direct impact on the lives of all debaters and non-debaters. This is also key to fairness because denying me from key topic literature severs access to good argumentation and thus hinders my ability to win the round.

3. Turn and DA Ground: Defending multiple actors grants the affirmative access to massive amounts of turn and DA ground as they can indict any of the actors involved in the plan. Single actor fiat only gives the aff access to offensive arguments related to that particular actor. This ground is key to education because it increases debaters' knowledge of different actors, and

increases depth of research that the negative will be able to use to win the round. This ground is also key to fairness because giving access to a sufficient quantity of offensive aff argumentation is necessary for the aff to have a fair chance to win the ballot.

International Fiat bad

A. Interpretation: the negative must defend the actor indicated by the resolution or specified by the affirmative.

B. Violation: My opponent fiats an international body.

C. Standards:

1. Real World: In the real world you cannot just fiat international actors such as the ICC and UN for two reasons.

a. There are multiple steps to getting a plan or resolution passed through these agencies. One cannot simply fiat the end result without justifying and proving the steps taken to get there. This is unfair because it allows my opponent to skip major steps and is not educational because these important and key steps aren't discussed.

b. International actor fiat allows the negative to assume the implementation of a policy that in reality has an incredibly low chance of ever being passed. This is unique to international actor fiat because:

i. Their difference in priorities and ideologies prevent them from coming to a consensus of the ultimate goal in pursuit.

ii. Their fundamental differences also prevent them from agreeing how to implement a plan.

iii. Having multiple actors increases the likelihood of failure of the plan because miscommunication and disagreements render the plan infeasible.

The neg fails to take into account the evaluation of the probability of policies being implemented. Thus a key aspect necessary in decision-making is lost because when deciding whether there is a significant opportunity cost to an action the probability of the next best option must be taken into consideration. **Strait and Wallace:**

Consider what it means when a judge votes affirmative or negative. Supposing the affirmative has presented a topical plan, the judge votes affirmative when the plan is shown to be net-advantageous when compared to the status quo or a competitive alternative; and the judge votes negative when the plan is shown to be less desirable than the status quo or a competitive alternative. If giving testimony to the Congress, the judge [they] could reasonably say: "based on the arguments I have heard over the last hour and a half, it would be better for you to do X than Y." In other words, after the debate is concluded, one entity could make a decision based on the information presented. This is not to say that Congress (or anyone else) should make decisions based on the outcomes of scholastic debate rounds—what is important is that the debaters will have gone through the process of making an informed decision. This is utterly impossible if the negative supports action from some other agent besides the one identified in the plan. Since the entire point of fiat is to bracket off questions of "would" in order to focus completely on questions of "should," questions of probability never get discussed. From the perspective of the agent identified in the plan, the probability is 100%, since if they decide to adopt the mandates of the plan, there is an absolute guarantee that they will in fact do so. Yet if the plan is compared to a counterplan in which Japan [is the actor] carries out public health assistance rather than the United States, there is never a situation where the United States could make a decision

based on 100% probability that Japan would take action if the United States did not. Thus, if the Congress had to consider if they should take action or some other decision-making body should take action, if they failed to consider the chance that the other decision-making body would not in fact take the desired action, they would not have gone through any sort of logical deliberation process. Yet this is exactly the way proponents of alternative agent fiat encourage debaters to think.

Thus policy makers do not rely upon the implementation of another plan without taking into consideration the probability of that other plan being passed.

Real-world decision-making is the only standard that matters in the context of debate. **Strait** and **Wallace Three** explain:

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decisions to join the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern is finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

3. **Under-limits ground:** If the negative may defend an international actor, the negative ground explodes because

- a. the negative has multiple different potential international actors they could possibly defend.
- b. the negative can defend countless possible different policy options for each of the multiple international actors

Failing to limit ground destroys competitive equity because then the negative is tremendously advantaged because they have access to more arguments to win them the ballot.

International fiat Good

A. Interpretation: The affirmative/negative may fiat an international agent**B. Standards:**

a. Political Relevance: In the world today, the most politically relevant actor is an international body such as the UN or the ICC. This is because they have the ability to affect the most countries as they are not only a coalition of countries but also have the ability to transcend international boundaries. Therefore, we ought to allow international fiat because it models the most politically relevant body, which is key to education. It is key to education because in the debate and through research we are learning how the real world process works.

b. Field context (make sure this does apply to resolution): Under the given resolution, an international actor fits into the field context of the resolution. Therefore if the field from which we evaluate the resolution has an international actor, it is only fair that I am allowed to fiat an international actor.

c. Turn and DA Ground: Defending multiple actors grants the affirmative access to massive amounts of turn and DA ground as they can indict the international actor specified by the counterplan. Ground indicting international actors is crucial for the affirmative because international actors involve multiple agents. Thus the aff. has the opportunity to generate offense from the multiple different actors' involvement in the international community as well as from the interaction with the nations within the international institution. This ground is key to education because it increases debaters' knowledge of the details of different actors, and increases depth of research that the negative will be able to use to win the round. This ground is also key to fairness because giving access to a sufficient quantity of offensive aff. argumentation is necessary for the aff. to win the ballot.

d. Topic Literature: Severing neg. access to arguments referring to international actors severs me from critical and prevalent topic literature. This interpretation renders useless topic literature about the UN, NATO, the EU, international criminal courts, etc. that discuss such action. This particular topic literature is key to education because it develops debater's understanding of international relations, allowing for a substantive education that will be critical and applicable in the real world because the internal arena has a direct impact on the lives of all debaters and non-debaters.

Private actor fiat bad

A. Interpretation: The < > may only fiat the actor of a sovereign nation state, international body, or multi-actor.

B. Violation: My opponent fiats a private actor.

C. Standards:

1. Unlimits negative ground: If the negative may defend an private actor, the negative ground explodes because:

- a. the negative has infinite potential private actors they could possible defend.
 - b. the negative can defend countless possible different policy options for each of the countless private actors.

Failing to limit ground destroys competitive equity because then the negative is tremendously advantaged because they have access to more arguments to win them the ballot. Overlimiting ground also destroys education because it then becomes impossible for the other debater to predict and prepare answers to all of the potential positions they may hit. This loss of predictability prevents debaters from engaging in each other's arguments and thus decreases clash, thereby eliminating the critical thinking and argument comparison that constitutes the educational aspect of debate.

2. Real World decision making: Real world decision makers must take into account the probability of the action being taken in order to decide if that is the best policy to pursue. Because an actor has no full control over any actor other than itself, it can never have a guarantee that another agent will act accordingly. The neg fails to take into account the evaluation of the probability of policies being implemented, a key aspect necessary in decision-making is lost. Strait and Wallace continue:

Consider what it means when a judge votes affirmative or negative. Supposing the affirmative has presented a topical plan, the judge votes affirmative when the plan is shown to be net-advantageous when compared to the status quo or a competitive alternative; and the judge votes negative when the plan is shown to be less desirable than the status quo or a competitive alternative. If giving testimony to the Congress, the judge [they] could reasonably say: “based on the arguments I have heard over the last hour and a half, it would be better for you to do X than Y.” In other words, after the debate is concluded, one entity could make a decision based on the information presented. This is not to say that Congress (or anyone else) should make decisions based on the outcomes of scholastic debate rounds—what is important is that the debaters will have gone through the process of making an informed decision. This is utterly impossible if the negative supports action from some other agent besides the one identified in the plan. Since the entire point of fiat is to bracket off questions of “would” in order to focus completely on questions of “should,” questions of probability never get discussed. From the perspective of the agent identified in the plan, the probability is 100%, since if they decide to adopt the mandates of the plan, there is an absolute guarantee that they will in fact do so. Yet if the plan is compared to a counterplan in which Japan [is the actor] carries out public health assistance rather than the United States, there is never a situation where the United States could make a decision based on 100% probability that Japan would take action if the United States did not. Thus, if the Congress had to consider if they should take action or some other decision-making body should take action, if they failed to consider the chance that the other decision-making body would not in fact take the desired action, they would not

have gone through any sort of logical deliberation process. Yet this is exactly the way proponents of alternative agent fiat encourage debaters to think.

Private actors are especially hard to predict because they are each driven by individual concerns and do not have obligations to anyone but themselves. Thus private actor action is impossible to predict and cannot be a potential option when making real world decisions.

Real-world decision-making is the only standard that matters in the context of debate. **Strait** and **Wallace Three** explain:

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decisions to join the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern is finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

Private actor Fiat good

A – Counterinterpretation: the negative may fiat an action taken by a private actor

B – I meet

C – Standards

1. Depth of discussion: Forcing the affirmative to compare their plan to a specific advocacy implemented by a private actor increases the depth of discussion because debaters are forced to defend and compare between different solvency evidence and strength of internal links. Specifying a very particular actor as opposed to a governmental or prominent figure gives rise to more in depth discussion of the affirmative advocacy because the affirmative is forced to think critically about how their evidence compares to the less prevalent alternative agents rather than make a general comparison to a predictable alt agent.

2. Breadth of research: Because there are multiple potential private actors, both debaters are incentivized to research more in order to prepare blocks to potential positions and to find the best private actors to advocate in their counterplan. Breadth of research of private actors is key to education because an understanding of the crucial actors of the international arena will be the most relative substantive knowledge to be carried outside of rounds because the actions of such actors will have a direct impact on us daily and thus will constantly be discussed.

3. Neg flexibility – The affirmative has the advantage of picking the plan for the debate and thus establishing the basis for the central argumentation of the round. Thus the affirmative has the substantive advantage going into the round because the aff gets to introduce an interpretation of the resolution that uniquely advantages them alone. Thus the negative needs to check back the affirmatives ability to skew the affirmative advantage by having the ability to adjust to and beat back any of the countless possible affirmatives. Thus neg ability to fiat the action of a private actor allows the neg to balance this aff advantage because since the affirmative has multiple options to choose from before the round, the negative must be able to have different potential counterplans to compete. Neg flexibility is thus key to fairness because it balances the offset of competitive equity created by the affirmative's ability to establish the grounds of the debate.

D. Vote:

PCCS Bad (Consult)

A. Interpretation: The neg may only run PCC's that are not dependent on external agents.

B. Violation: The neg has runs a PCC in which they consult an external agent.

C. Standards:

1. Predictability: There are an infinite amount of agents the neg. can choose for his/her consult PCC. Because there are essentially an infinite amount of agents, I can never truly know which one my opponent will choose, and thus, consult PCC's are unpredictable. Predictability is key to fairness, because if I don't know neg. advocacy, I have no way to prepare for it, whereas my opponent will be super prepped out for it, creating an unfair situation

2. Impact Ground: By running a PCC, the negative co-opts all my impacts. Essentially, my opponent forces me to debate against my own plan. The entire CP is just do the affirmative plan AFTER a certain agent is consulted, meaning that I am forced to either,

A. Attack my own plan, only to have my opponent kick the PCC and turn my case in the next speech

OR

B. Ignore the PCC

3. Clash: My opponent running a PCC allows him to avoid having to respond and clash with my advocacy. This is uneducational, because it stops us from having a substantive debate. A substantive debate is important because it is where most the education in the round comes from. Also without clash the debate looses educational value in the sense of learning argumentation skills.

4. Plan Ground: The negative fails to be textually competitive with the affirmative. What this means is that the negative is not only doing the affirmative plan and more, but that more could potentially be part of the aff's original plan as it is textually competitive. This means that the negative is taking the aff's plan ground. Plan ground is key to fairness because it is one of the few ways that the affirmative can solve the resolution.

PCCS Bad (Delay)

A. Interpretation: The neg may only run counter-plans that are enacted in the present.

B. Violation: The neg has run a counter-plan that is in the future.

C. Standards:

1. Predictability: If it is impossible to predict any time in the future when they will pass the CP. It could be from a second after the plan passes or go on infinitely. Because there is no context of the CP when it is, I can never generate any offense against it. This destroys fairness in any given debate because it allows one debater to never actually just engage in clash but force one to prove the impossible. Also, This hurts education because we can never predict what we are learning about then we wont be able to learn it.

2. Research Burdens: Not only is the AFF burdened to research the impacts of the plan in the statusquo but is now burdened with researching impacts into the distant future which is impossible because the future is uncertain and has not been fully constructed. The neg however, has a much easier research burden because merely have to have to research for their PCC. . This is inherently unfair, because one side should not have to do a substantially more amount of research, and uneducational because if I am forced to research every single PCC, I cannot actually go in depth with my research.

3. Quality of Ground: By waiting until later to implement the PCC the neg unfairly skews the quality of the ground in their favor. They do this by waiting until the quality of the ground each side is debating on has changed in their favor and then and only then, implementing the PCC. The quality of ground is key to fairness because ground is our ability to generate offense and so if they wait until they can generate higher quality offense they are being a distinct advantage which is unfair. Also delaying harms education in a debate round because then there is no necessity for clash about whether or not it would work in modern because either side could say wait 20 years for when it is favorable and so

4. Clash: My opponent running a PCC allows him to avoid having to respond and clash with my advocacy. This is uneducational, because it stops us from debating the substantive debate, which is the most educational part of the round, whereas forcing my opponent to actually clash with my advocacy forces him to make substantive arguments.

D.

PCCS Bad (Condition)

A. Interpretation: The neg may only run a PCC that has no additional conditions.

B. Violation: The neg has added a condition to their PCC.

C. Standards:

1. Predictability: There are an infinite number of antecedents that could be added on to a plan which makes prep impossible for the AFF because I can never truly know which one my opponent will choose, and thus, condition PCC's are unpredictable. This destroys fair debate because it grants one side a much larger advantage for winning before coming in the round.

2. Underlimiting: Allowing the neg to put any conditions on their PCC is under limiting the neg. This is bad as it gives them access to an absurd number of ways to avoid any potential harms that come as a result of running the PCC without conditions. In order to be fair in this any given debate round we must not under limit the neg because it only gives them access to aff arguments, which is unfair.

3. Ground Skew: his skew's the ground to the NEG's favor because they can generate any offense off of the smallest disadvantage and justify it for the CP. This renders any AFF impact, regardless of the size, meaningless because if the NEG gets a risk of offense then the CP is beneficial. The AC is irrelevant and guarantees that debate will only occur on the NEG side. This means that the AFF can never win because their ground is irrelevant in the NEG world which hurts fairness because competitive equity is violated. Plus this hurts education because we only engage in irrelevant debate on one side but ignore half of the resolution which means we can never maximize our education.

D.

PCCS Good (General)

A. Interpretation: The neg may run PCC.

B. I meet: I run a PCC.

C. Standards:

1. **Real World Applicability:** Allowing for time frame permutations allows the debate to reflect the real world as much as possible. Policy makers always have to consider the external, when making decisions. Real world decision making has the strongest internal link to education.

The scope of negative fiat and the logic of decision making. L. Paul Strait George Mason University **and** Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

Also, this is key to fairness because arguments that aren't grounded in the real world are unpredictable as they are fundamentally different, giving me a disadvantage by forcing me to run something that my everyday experience contradicts

2. **Best Policy Option:** We test the AC to find the best policy option, this increases education by testing the validity of the AC. This is real world because policy makers do this all the time to see what the best course of action is and adjust policy based on the finding.

3. **CP Ground:** By allowing for PCCs, we are preserving an important type of CP ground for the negative. This is important for the debate because without this ground, the debate becomes unfairly skewed.

D.

Word pics bad

Interpretation – The negative may not use a word pic.

Violation – The negative used a word pic.

Standards –

1. Stealing Ground – word PICs steal the majority of offense of the affirmative – drawing down the debate to the functionality of the word “the” or some other insignificant difference. This kills education by allowing the neg to steal all of the affirmative’s offense, killing clash and kills fairness by making it so that the aff can never win.

2. Strategy Skew -The negative cannot be allowed to create a counter-plan that includes the affirmative’s entire plan with only an insignificant addition because the negative is then immediately allowed to solve for everything in the affirmative world. In addition, the NEG is allowed to gain net benefits off of the counter-plan as well. This is extremely unfair because the affirmative’s plan then becomes insignificant if the negative is consistently able to add resolutional advocacies to their counter-plan. In reality they are just advocating affirmative ground. The negative then has a much greater opportunity to win the round because they simply took the affirmative’s plan and incorporated it into their own, making the debate extremely un-educational as it doesn’t force negative to come up with creative strategies that explore other facets of the debate.

3. Clash- By using a plan inclusive counter-plan, the negative is eliminating any textual competition between the affirmative’s plan which removes a relatively large amount of clash from the debate round. This occurs due to the fact that the entire affirmative plan is being used in the negative regardless. There can be no arguments about why the affirmative plan is bad, but only why we should prefer the counter-plan, which allows for much less clash in the round. Because clash is where we apply the most of our critical thinking and argumentation skills, eliminating clash in round allows for an extremely un-educational debate.

Word pics good

Interpretation: The negative may run word PICs

Standards

Real world decision-making- Word-PICs best reflect how decision makers choose options. If a policy has a racial slur, they take it out so to not cause bad impacts. As policy makers try to find the best policy option, words are added or removed in this pursuit. Real world decision making is the most important impact to education.

L. Paul Strait (George Mason University) and Brett Wallace 2(George Washington University)
“The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making” WFU Debater’s Research Guide
2007,<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/2007/The%20Scope%20of%20Negative%20Fiat%20and%20the%20Logic%20of%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate is the key still. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends all boundaries between categories of learning like “policy education” and “kritik education,” it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

Better AC writing- word pics force affs to actually know their plans and write good acs. They must know why every word in their text is important and not just randomly throw together a sentence as their plan text. With better plan texts come better and more nuanced debate that encourages critical thinking instead of generic responses to advantages. And, we learn how to make better ACs meaning we encourage how to find the best policy option which is what real world decision makers try to do, linking to straight and Wallace. Finally, this isn’t unreasonable as they only have to justify one sentence. If they say this burden is too high, they are just being too lazy to defend the entirety of *one* sentence that *they* wrote.

Depth of research- by PICing out of one word, we go deep into the literature and find specific evidence for why one issue, a single word, is good or bad. Nothing can be more in-depth than a single word as all evidence concerning it revolves around this singular argument. Depth of research is key to education because we only learn arguments when we have a deep enough understanding of it to apply in other fields.

Breath of research- there are many words in the resolution/AC plan texts that could be used. This encourages us to research many issues regarding the implications of using words. The negs must research across many critical fields to find the best word PIC and affs have to research all of their plan text to be prepared for pics. We research a breath of words across the lit, meaning we learn more rather than less, thus clearly increasing our education.

Depth of argumentation: we go deep into one issue for the debate- a single word. This is the most depth we can have in round as we deeply explore the nuances of a single issue. We get the education of deep thinking and clash instead of responding at the tagline level. Word PICS force us to have a specific understanding of what we debate.

Breadth of argumentation- as explained that there are many different word PICS, people PIC out of different words meaning over the course of the year we debate many different pics instead of stale debates over utilitarianism/deontology and generic topic stuff every round.

Finally, no other type of education applies more directly to our lives than education about specific words. We use thousands of them all the time in our every day discourse, meaning what we learn from them is systemic and encompassing of almost everything we do. And, the words we use affect our action, meaning it affects us the most.

Lakoff writes:

Lakoff, George. [Professor of Linguistics at UC Berkeley, co-founder and Senior Fellow of the Rockridge Institute]. "Metaphorical Thought in Foreign Policy," December 1999. <www.frameworkinstitute.org/products/metaphoricalthought.pdf>.

Cognitive linguistics is the field that studies this crucial part of what GII needs. It is a systematic, scientific approach within the cognitive sciences to the study of how we understand. **How we act in a situation depends on how we understand it. Our mechanisms of understanding are mostly unconscious;** we have no direct conscious access to how we understand. **Cognitive science**, the

interdisciplinary study of the mind, has made some deep and important **discover[ed]**ies about the mechanisms of understanding. One is **that we have** systems of conceptual structures (called "frames" and "scripts") **that we use to understand situations in the world**. Another is that our understanding is, to a large extent, not straightforward or "literal," but rather makes use of a system of conceptual metaphors — ways to understand concepts in terms of other concepts, as when we understand affection in terms of warmth or purposes in terms of reaching destinations. Another important finding is that language is directly connected to such unconscious conceptual systems and metaphors. How we talk matters; one can learn a lot about how people frame situations from how they talk. Conversely, having effective language to express ideas is extremely powerful. Merely hearing **the language** again and again **plants in the mind a mode of understanding. And if you can affect how others understand situations, you can affect what they do in those situations.** In short, **there is a link** from language **to** conceptual framing to **action**. And in many cases, **the link is from** metaphorical **language** to metaphorical framing to action.

Textual > Mechanical Competition

Grounded in text – the text is the only stable basis for how the plan works. Thus the text is the only basis for how we evaluate competition. Topic lit is biased by their authors, killing fairness and education because the bias causes them to ignore alternative arguments and the like.

Sloppy Affs – textual competition emphasizes the importance of each word in the advocacy and the difference between the two. Failure to do so fails to hold the aff to their advocacy and incentivizes vague and incoherent aff writing so that they can capture as much neg offense as possible, killing fairness because of the possible advocacy shift and killing education by preventing clash.

Depth good – in-depth understanding of the effects of advocacies can only be evaluated after understanding the effects of the text. This creates a more educational debate and a more fair, because we can objectively understand all the effects of the advocacies

Mechanical > Textual Competition

A) Bad perms – textual competition causes arbitrary permutations not based on the effects. These perm are uniquely bad from debate because it separates the debate from educations and real world impacts – uniquely skewing ground away from the neg.

B) Switch Side debate – textual competition kills switch side debating because both sides advocate the same thing but differently worded. This kills fairness because the neg can co-opt all aff offense and kills education by preventing clash. Mechanical competition solves because the sides focus on the effects of the advocacies, not how they are worded.

Chapter 6: Kritik Alternatives

Non-existent Alts Bad

Interpretation- K's must have an alternative

Violation- my opponent is running a K without an alternative

C. Standards

1. DA Ground-

Running K's with no alt skews my ground by denying me the ability to run DAs to the alternative or link them into their own K.

They can never show tangible solvency, which makes me lose my ability to indict the effectiveness of this alternative, which means I lose more ground to answer the K.

Turn ground is key to fairness because when I have less ways to affirm/negate the resolution and my opponent has an easier job of winning then they are put at a structural advantage which makes this unfair.

Magic wand – Not having a K alt means that either

You vote for me because they can never solve for any of the impacts, or

They have to use utopian fiat to solve their impacts which is going to outweigh any other argument to fairness because it allows them to wish away any and all harms, and education because we don't learn anything by just hoping that everything we want will come true.

1. **Reciprocity:** I am forced to advocate an alternative to the squo, the K has to have the same burden of providing an alternative to the world they are criticizing. If the K didn't have this, this would destroy reciprocal burdens because in order to win all the neg has to do is just prove that there is something wrong that may happen but not that is solvable.

Stable advocacy: When there is no alt in the K, all my offense becomes meaningless because in my opponent's next speech, they can articulate an alternative and get rid of all my offense. This avoids clash which is key to fairness and education and justifies new plans in the 2AR.

D. Voters

Rejection is not an alternative

Interpretation- K's must have an alternative

Violation- my opponent is running a K without an alternative. They claim that their alt is just rethinking the problem but that's not an alternative because it doesn't promote another course of action and we can't quantify what it actually means.

Standards

Turn Ground-

Running K's with no alt skews my ground by denying me the ability to turn the alternative or link them into their own K.

They can never show tangible solvency, which makes me lose my ability to indict the effectiveness of this alternative. Thus I lose key arguments that answer the K.

Turn ground is key to fairness because when I have less ways to affirm/negate the resolution and my opponent has an easier job of winning then they are put at a structural advantage which makes this unfair.

Advocacy shift-

Any turns or disads I make to the alternative can just be shifted out of in the next speech because there is no specific advocacy that they are held to. Disads and turns are to key negative ground because it is one of the main ways we can generate offense. If I'm denied my main route to generating offense then I am put at a structural disadvantage in picking up the ballot which makes this unfair. This also destroys clash because it allows them to not answer my augmentations and shift out of them instead, decreasing educational comparative debate.

Advocacy shift links to in-round predictability because if they have the ability to change their advocacy in the middle of the round, there's no way I can predict what they're going to go for. In-round predictability is key to fairness because if I don't know what their advocacy will be, I can never challenge it which means they always win.

Magic wand – Not having a K alt means that either

You vote for me because they can never solve for any of the impacts, or

They have to use utopian fiat to solve their impacts which is going to outweigh any other argument to fairness because it allows them to wish away any and all harms, and education because we don't learn anything by just hoping that everything we want will come true.

Time skew- in order to answer back this vague attempt at an alternative I need to spend more time answering all the possible ways it could be construed in the next speech. This means my opponent gets a time advantage. My opponent doing less work on the Alt conversely makes me do *more* work on the alternative which gives them a structural advantage which links to fairness.

5. real world decision making. Rejection is not consistent with real world decision making as one cannot simply abstain from making a decision in the event that one of the options has negative effects;; plans of action must be evaluated in relation to alternative courses of action, not abstention to truly promote real world decision making. Strait and Wallace explain why learning how to make decisions is the only aspect of debate applicable to our everyday lives. they write

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. **Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories [of] learning like "policy education" and "kririk education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain.** The implication for this analysis

is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are conductively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives.)

D: Voter

Policymaking > kritik framework

A. Interpretation: The negative may only defend a policy making framework for evaluation of impacts

B. violation: The negative defends the kritik framework for evaluation of impacts

1: Real world decision-making.

A: The kritik framework is not consistent with real world decision making because real world decision makers do not attempt to uproot the entirety of preexisting systems simply because they think that those systems are bad i.e. capitalism but merely do the best that they possibly can under a current system.

B: We do not say that a decision is bad because of the way it is worded which marginalizes others or justifies bad things, but merely because of the implications of making that decision. Strait and Wallace explain why learning how to make decisions is the only aspect of debate applicable to our every day lives. they write

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories [of] learning like "policy education" and "kririk education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are conductively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives.)

C. The K prevents us from looking to real world policies, thus preventing our rethinking of thinking in order to craft meaningful theory about the world

Jarvis, senior lecturer @ University of Australia, 2K
(D.S.L. International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism)

There are, of course, problems with ontologically derived forms of theory. Postmodernists naturally dismiss this conception of theory and are not entirely wrong for doing so. Realism is not above criticism, and structural-realism even more so.⁵⁸ But then again, neither is postmodernism! But this is not the point. I am not here attempting to defend realism against postmodernism or to dismiss postmodernism entirely from the purview of International Relations. Rather, what I am attempting to do is defend the institution of theory against postmodernism which, in its more virulent forms, aims at its deconstruction and obliteration. So too am I attempting to defend the ontological aspect of theory against those who would engage exclusively in epistemological debate. For there to be theory in International Relations, ontological description must be the first order of things; without first defining the domain of international politics, identifying those entities and things we wish to explain and understand, epistemological debate would be altogether pointless. Save for this, the discipline threatens to transpose itself into philosophy and not International Relations, to be condemned to perpetual metaphysical reflection but without reference to the social world we are attempting to understand. Of course, this does not exonerate us from previous mistakes. International Relations, largely because of the dominance of positivism in the discipline, has, in the past, been apt to ontological description in the absence of epistemological reflection.

Practitioners in the discipline have rarely seen a need to question the epistemological basis of their scholarship as Thomas Biersteker forcefully acknowledged.⁵⁹ Yet, as he also reminds us, developing theory and generating knowledge requires judicious use of both ontological description and epistemological explanation. These are not mutually exclusive dimensions of theoretical discourse, but the elemental ingredients necessary to the construction of discourse itself. The exclusive focus upon one dimension to the detriment of the other probably explains why, according to William Kreml and Charles Kegley, "International relations research today. . . has failed to reach agreement about several fundamental issues. . . (1) the central questions to be asked, (2) the basic units of analysis (e.g., states or nonstate actors), (3) the levels of analysis at which various questions should be explored, (4) the methods by which hypotheses should be tested and unwarranted inferences prevented, (5) the criteria by which theoretical progress is to be judged, and (6) how inquiry should be organized in order to generate the knowledge that will lead to international peace, prosperity, and justice."

The critique ignores the practical side of life. We must be able to use logic and rationality in order to solve the basic problems of our society.

Jarvis, senior lecturer @ University of Australia, 2K
(D.S.L. International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism)

To what end these approaches will prove beneficial, however, to what end their concerns and depictions of current realities prove accurate remains problematic. What does seem obvious, though, is the continuing desire for understanding, the need to examine, comprehend, and make sense of events and, consequently, the need for theoretical endeavor. Despite "nihilistic despair" or charges of epochal change, most of us will wake up tomorrow confronted by a world much the same as today, one that experiences the recurring problems of inequality, injustice, war, famine, violence, and conflict. Various problems will emerge and solutions to them will be sought. These, surely, cannot be deconstructed as the subversive postmodernists insist, but only reinscribed as new questions. And while we might problematize current knowledge and interpretations, question our faith in science, reason, and logic, or reinscribe questions in new contexts, to suppose these endeavors contrary to the activity of theory and the search for meaning and understanding seems plainly absurd. If we abandon the principles of logic and reason, dump the yardsticks of objectivity and assessment, and succumb to a blind relativism that privileges no one narrative or understanding over another, how do we tackle such problems or assess the merits of one solution vis-à-vis another? How do we go about the activity of living, making decisions, engaging in trade, deciding on social rules or making laws, if objective criteria are not to be employed and reason and logic abandoned? How would we construct research programs, delimit areas of inquiry or define problems to be studied if we abandon rationalist tools of inquiry?

The endless questioning necessitated by critiques prevents us from rationally making decisions. This destroys education because the critical arguments ignore real world application and thus cannot be utilized outside of rounds. This also links to fairness because if arguments are not grounded in the real world it will be impossible for debaters to predict the world that will be created in round. Predictability is key to fairness because one debater is severely disadvantaged if they are not prepared to make strong arguments that win the ballot.

2: Adjudicability: It is easier to judge debate rounds under the policy making framework than under the K framework because the policy framework just requires a comparison by the debaters of costs and benefits and the advancement of competing moral theories for examining policy action which link back to some operative term in the resolution. However, the K framework does not provide reasons why discourse that justifies bad things constitutes a neg ballot or how to adjudicate between competing discourse claims, which destroys fairness as it begs judge intervention on what discursive impacts are worst.

3. Topic education: the negative changes the debate to a subject matter that is not relevant to the core topic issue. Because critical arguments can be generically linked to advocacies of multiple topics, they do not address the specific issues addressed in the resolution. Topic specific discussion is key for education because debaters then learn from a breadth of research because they are forced to learn about the different issues surrounding all of the different topics rather than only develop one advocacy to apply throughout the year. Policy making also accommodates for depth of research because debaters research in depth to develop specific plans to run on this topic, and still cover a breadth of issues as they write different plans for each topic.

Non-implementable K Alts Bad

A. Interpretation:

K alts. must be realistic policy options.

Violation:

The K alt. can't be implemented in the real world

B. Standards:

1. Disadvantage ground:

I lose all ground to implementation indicts and disadvantages because they never give a tangible implementation method. This ground is key to answering K's, and fairness because if I can't garner offense off of the alternative, then I can never win.

2. Real World:

In real world decision making, advocacies actually have to be implemented. To deny this would destroy fairness because I am forced to implement my plan but the K doesn't have to implement the alt. Real world decision making is key to education. The scope of negative fiat and the logic of decision making. L. Paul Strait George Mason University and Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

3. Fiat abuse: Lack of a functional K alternative is unfair because it is a form of object fiat in that instead of indirectly advocating a plan to attempt to solve the problem, the negative is essentially wishing away the problems. This is unfair, because as

Strait and Wallace Four writes:

An examination of the question of fiatting “the object” makes our position even more clear. Except for those who believe in ‘negative flexibility’ as a cult-like religion, everyone agrees that the negative should not be able to fiat the object of the plan; otherwise their win percentage would skyrocket at the expense of the affirmative.

Imagine you are running an affirmative which gives condoms and educational assistance in order to solve an HIV/AIDS advantage. What substantive answer would you have to a counterplan that had all people infected with HIV become celebrate? Or suppose your plan was designed to solve a genocide. The counterplan to have the culpable government cease killing people probably solves your affirmative better than you could ever hope to with the plan. These counterplans are intuitively unfair, making it impossible for the affirmative to generate offense.

But what rule would we adopt to preclude their discussion? Perhaps the negative should not be able to fiat a decision-maker who is affected by the plan. Even if there was some non-arbitrary way to decide what and who the plan affects, it is unclear if even that rule would be sufficient. Consider affirmatives which argue that the World Health Organization is making something worse, perhaps by offering defective medicine or equipment and so the plan has the United States increase public health assistance in order to offset the poor assistance in the status quo. The counterplan to have the WHO (the object of the plan is still somewhere in sub-Saharan Africa), so our previously identified rule is insufficient for excluding this counterplan, yet it is also intuitively unfair. When alternative agent fiat is allowed, there really is no non-arbitrary method of preventing object fiat. Since every harm area is a consequence of no one's solving it, every alternative agent counterplan is at least a little bit object fiat. While some counterplans are clearly “more unfair” than others, if we can agree with the general principle that object fiat harms competitive equity, the only true solution is to prevent all alternative agent fiat.

non-textual alts bad**A. Interpretation:**

K alts. must have an explicit text

B. Violation:

There is no text to the alternative

C. Standards**1. Advocacy:**

Because the K alt. does not have an explicit text, I do not know what it is. This creates a moving target because if I generate offense off what I think the K alt. is, my opponent could just say that was not the alt. they were advocating and get out of all of my offense. This destroys fair debate because I cannot generate offense, and thus win. This also harms education because we cannot learn how to solve the K.

2. Time skew

By not having a text to the alternative, this allows my opponent be a moving target and thus get out of all my offense. This creates a time skew because by getting out of my offense, my opponent renders all the time I spent making those responses useless. A time skew is inherently unfair because it gives one side a clear advantage over the other.

3. Reciprocity:

I am forced to have a text to my plan and present a stable advocacy but the K doesn't have to have a written description between the status quo and the K. This destroys reciprocal burdens because it forces one debater to achieve more while granting an easy out for the other. This also encourages argument irresponsibility because the K is not responsible for defending the alt but I am forced to defend my text for the entirety of the debate. This exacerbates the imbalance of fairness.

Non-Specified Actor Bad

A. Interpretation:

The K must have an actor specified

B. Violation:

The K does not specify an actor but just an abstract entity

C. Standards:**1. Predictability:**

Because the actor isn't specified in the K, there are an infinite amount of actors my opponent can choose. This lack of specificity prevents me from making responses, because I cannot respond to something that does not exist. This destroys fairness, because if I cannot respond, I cannot win, and education, because if I cannot respond, we can't have an actual, educational debate.

2. Moving target

This creates a moving target because if I generate offense off of an actor that I think would happen in the world of the K, my opponent could just say that was not the actor they were advocating and get out of all of my offense. This destroys fair debate because I cannot generate offense, and thus win. This also harms education because we never learn about how to solve the K.

Real world applicability:

Not specifying an actor isn't real world, because we don't debate a realistic actor, which isn't real world. Real world decision making is key to education

The scope of negative fiat and the logic of decision making. L. Paul Strait George Mason University and Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like “policy education” and “kritik education,” it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

Res K's Bad

A. Interpretation:

K's must be linked to the affirmative advocacy and not the resolution in general

B. Violation:

The K is linked to the resolution

C. Standards:

1. For my opponent to run a K on a word in the resolution is to say that **affs. should never win.** The aff. debater is forced to either

A. Debate the topic and link into the K.

B. Not debate the resolution, and be called untopical

Thus, because I am forced to debate the resolution, I should not be punished for something in it.

Blame the framers of the resolution for being inconsiderate, not the debater.

2. Breadth

Allowing my opponent to run a K on a word in the resolution allows him/her to run the same thing over and over, and not have to make or research other argument. Thus, by prohibiting the K, it forces him/her to research, allowing for education

3. Clash

My opponent running a K on a word in a resolution allows him to avoid having to respond and clash with my

advocacy because K's come before the substantive debate. This is unfair because this makes my advocacy

meaningless, and uneducational, because it stops us from debating the substantive debate, which is the most

educational part of the round.

Chapter 7: Permutations

Permutations Need a Text

A – Interpretation Every permutation must have a text.

B- Violation There is no text to the perm.

C- Standards

1. Moving Target: Without an explicit text, the permutation becomes a moving target. My opponent can respond to any argument I make about how s/he perms by morphing it to delink responses. The interpretation solves by holding the permutation to an explicit implementation. Moving targets are unfair as I can only win the round if I can answer my opponent's case. Moving targets make answering my opponent's arguments virtually impossible. Moreover, they allow my opponent to have an uncontestable piece of offense or defense that puts him/her at a structural advantage because they can contest all of my offense and defense. Moving targets also harm education since they dodge all clash in the round by evading my responses. Clash is key to education as we learn from debate by comparing the advantages of different advocacies.

2. Real world application- In the real world policy makers are forced to use a text for their advocacy. No one would pass a bill that wasn't written out. This is an internal link to real world education because using a text best models how a procedure would take place in the real world. Real world education is the biggest link to education because the skills we learn in debate are only valuable in so far as we can apply them in the real world.

3. Reciprocity – The neg is forced to an alt or cp text; consequently, the aff should also be forced to a perm text. Reciprocity is key to fairness because the same thing should be required of both debaters to win the round or it is skewed towards one side and therefore unfair.

4. Comparing Worlds: Without a stable perm text we can't compare worlds, as the world with a permutation is nebulous. My interpretation solves because it holds the perm to an explicit text so we know exactly what the aff. world looks like. As a result, we know exactly how the neg. and aff. worlds interact. The ability to compare worlds is key to fairness for if this comparison cannot be made, then there is no objective reason to prefer the aff or neg worlds. This forces the judge to intervene which is unfair as it rewards a debater for something they didn't do. This is also key to education as debate teaches us to compare the advantages of different options. Since my interpretation is the only one that permits for comparison, it is the most educational.

Perm is an advocacy

A. Interpretation- The affirmative is allowed to advocate the world of the perm

B. I meet

C. Standards

1. **Time Skew:** If the perm isn't an advocacy then it's a time skew for the affirmative. By testing the competition of the CP and proving that it's non-competitive, the perm becomes defense on the CP. This skews my time because I have to answer the CP, but if I can't garner offense off of it. This also justifies running multiple non-competitive CP's so that my opponent can waste all of my time. Since it's beneficial for the affs to increase their advocacy, perming has an advantage, which mitigates the time skew.
2. **Real World Decision Making:** In the real world, policy makers look to see if they can include additional components to their original plans. Since there is no advantage for the aff to use the perm as a test of competition, they are disincentivized from running it which is disingenuous to the way policy makers act. Real world decision making is key to education. L. Paul Strait George Mason University and Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity.

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," **it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain.** The implication for this analysis is that **the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives.** While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those **skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.**

Checks back multiple neg advocacies- The world of the perm checks back multiple conditional negative advocacies because it makes them a risk issue for the negative. Internal link to education because the negative will run better more warranted and more competitive advocacies if they know that they are a risk issue

D.

Perm is a test of competition

- the perm is only a test of competition
- B- They are advocating the world of the perm.

C-Standards

- 1. Advocacy focus-** if they are allowed to defend and gain offence from the world of the perm the affirmative can win on benefits that don't have anything to do with their AC. This kills topic specific education because they can just derive random benefits off of the perm.
- 2. Advocacy shifting-** Counterplans are designed to show the opportunity cost of an advocacy. If the counter plan isn't competitive it just means its no longer an opportunity cost. The logical conclusion isn't that it would then become part of the plan it just means its no longer a disadvantage to the plan this is a voter for fairness because adding a noncompetitive non- topical plank to your plan is an advocacy shift just like it would be if you added that we should do the plan and give candy to babies in the lar.
- 3. Non- unique-** Even if they win that it's an advocacy the benefits are non-unique because they also happen in the world of the counter plan. This means even if they win theory only unique offence of the perm will be the offence of the plan.

D.

Severance permutations bad

A is Interpretation: To perm the CP the aff must continue to defend the entirety their original advocacy.

B is Violation: The Aff severed part of their original advocacy to perm the CP.

C is Standards:

Turn Ground: Severing parts of their advocacy allows my opponent to kick the arguments I'm answering offensively. My interp solves because s/he has to be held to a stable advocacy so they can't kick my turns. Turn ground is key to fairness as my opponent would otherwise have access to offensive arguments which I can't gain offense off of. This makes it easier for them to win as they have easier access to offense.

Strat Skew: I can never form a coherent strategy if s/he can sever. I don't know what arguments to go for because s/he'll just sever out all answers I make and go for the arguments that I will inevitably undercover. Strategy skew is key to fairness as I need to be able to formulate a strategy to compete with my opponent. It's also key to education as debate teaches us how to make strategic decisions. We only learn how to make strategic decisions if we can formulate strategies.

SEVERANCE PERMutationS GOOD

A is Counter Interpretation: The aff can sever part of their original advocacy to perm the CP.

B is Standards:

Aff Flex: I must be able to sever parts of my advocacy as it would be impossible for me to be able to extend the 6 minute AC in four minutes. Permitting severance perms therefore grants me aff flexibility as I have greater control over which arguments I can go for. This increases fairness as anything which makes it harder to negate mitigates the empirical negative win bias.

Real World Decision Making: In the real world, policy makers choose to adopt the best plan possible. This means that they reject parts of their original plans and adopt new measures to maximize net benefits. This means, that severance perms most closely resemble real world decision making. Real world decision making is key to education.

Straight and Wallace

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decisions to join the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern is finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

Intrinsicness Permutations Bad

- A) **Interpretation** – The aff must permute the CP by doing the plan and all or part of the CP.
- B) **Violation** – The aff permutes by doing the plan, all or part of the CP and a third action.
- C) **Standards** –
 - a. **Clash** – Intrinsic perms justify the affirmative perming out of every D/A or CP with the intrinsic perm. This kills fairness by making it impossible for the neg. to win because the aff. can perm out of any arguments. Furthermore, it kills education by preventing any sort of a clash.
 - b. **Moving Target** – The perm makes the aff. a moving target because it advocates an advocacy different from either the plan or the counterplan. This ultimately kills fairness because it spikes against the offense I built up in the last speech and kills education by preventing clash.
 - c. **Infinitely regressive** – The permutation could do the plan, the CP, and create world peace. The negative would never be able to predict which of the thousands of different ways the aff. could add something to the perm to get around the net benefits.
 - d. **Time skew** – Running an intrinsic permutation is essential running 3 conditional plans that are portrayed in one sentence. This is in the sense that these plans can be dropped. Because the neg's argument can be dropped anytime, there is a time skew in which the neg. has time to answer. This is completely unfair as the affirmative has to choice of dropping it anytime. By ensuring that the affirmative uses on the original advocacy we are promoting fairness in the round.
 - e. **Predictability:** I have no way to predict which third action my opponent will fiat to perm the CP. This is unfair as if I can't predict what action they will fiat, I can't prepare responses to that argument, so s/he will have quantitatively better research on that action than I do. Moreover, I will be forced to answer a new argument in the 2NR, which effectively forces me to go new in the two. My interp. solves because I can reasonably predict the plan and counterplan.

Intrinsicness permutations good

A is Interpretation: The aff may perm the CP and fiat an additional action.

B is Standards:

1. **Real World Decision Making:** In the real world policy makers look for most viable policy options. So they often modify an original plan to accept alternative plans and other actions. Therefore, intrinsic permutations best resemble real world decision making. Real world decision making is key to education. L. Paul Strait George Mason University and Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity.

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

Research Burden – Intrinsic perms make the neg research all possible ways their impacts can be solved, so that their authors advocate the CP. This improves clash and creates more actor specific knowledge, increasing education.

Critical thinking – Intrinsic perms force the neg to think quickly and effectively to answer strategic permutations. This increases the unique form of education that we value debate for.

Check for disadvantages- By adding the new essential part to the original advocacy, it solves for the disadvantage against the advocacy. This allows the debater to add one more plan to be added to give the advocacy more weight. This creates an extra plan that needs to be argued allowing more clash to occur. This will cause the education process to increase allowing the debaters to have more knowledge.

Aff flexibility- The aff should have the flexibility to run an extra new plan to balance out the time skew. Because the neg is structurally advantageous, it gives the negative more time to answer the permutation. Therefore, in order to check back the time skew, the aff should have the flexibility to add a plan to create fairness.

Time Frame Permutations Bad

A. Interpretation: The aff must permute the CP within the same timeframe as the CP and Plan.

B. Violation: They change the timeframe to perm the CP.

C. Standards:

1. Impact Ground: My opponent is given access to their impacts and the impacts they get from delaying the plan. This A. explodes impact ground for them AND B. denies the fact that when we wait the uniqueness of the perm changes. The implication is they are no longer entitled to the impacts of the perm as the global political system changes constantly. Impact ground is key to fairness as letting one debater have impacts they aren't entitled to makes it easier for them to win the round as they have greater access to offense.

2. Clash: My opponent running a time frame permutation allows him to avoid having to respond and clash with my advocacy. This is uneducational, because it stops us from debating the substantive debate, whereas forcing my opponent to actually clash with my advocacy forces him to make substantive arguments. A substantive debate is key to education because it is where we do our in round learning.

D.

Time Frame Permutations Good

A. Counter-Interpretation: The aff may perm the CP in an alternate time frame from the initial Plan and CP.

B. I meet.

C. Standards:

1. Real World Decision Making: In the real world policy makers are sometimes forced to wait to enact the plan and first enact other policies. Time frame perms therefore best reflect real world policy making. Real world decision making is key to education. L. Paul Strait George Mason University and Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

2. AFF Flexibility: The affirmative is inherently at a disadvantage due to LD's time skew. This is proven by empirical data that has shown that negatives win percentage is much higher. Furthermore, the negative has flexibility to chose the case of their choice while the permutations runs off the outcome fo the counter plan. In this case, there is absolutely no flexibility for the aff. By allowing the affirmative to set up the time frame for the permutation, it increases the fairness of the debate.

D.

Chapter 8: Burdens

Single NIB Bad

Interpretation – both debaters must run Necessary and sufficient burdens

Violation – the aff/neg runs a necessary but insufficient burden

Standards

- a. **Strategy skew-** When my opponent ran a NIB, he/she put into a double bind: either I use up precious time and answer the burden which I cannot win offense from or I ignore and let my opponent to win off it. Either way I lose. This is uneducational because we value debate for good and strategic decision making. This double bind prevents me from exercising strategic decision making because whatever of the two choices I make results in me losing.
- b. **Clash-** Because I have to read this shell I can't clash on a substantive level. Because there isn't clash in the round it becomes impossible for the judge to evaluate creating intervention. This kills fairness because intervention is arbitrary. This is uneducational because clash is the main reason debate is educationally attractive.
- c. **Reciprocal ground-** NIBs skew ground because he/she only has to win a single link to the standard while I have to win the both AC and 100% of the NC while he/she can win either. This skew makes it impossible for me to win the round killing fairness and killing education because he/she doesn't have to substantively clash or weigh.

Time Skew – Running necessary but insufficient burden skews my time because I have to respond to any arguments that link to the burden and they can just kick them in the next speech. This skew is uniquely abusive because it doesn't matter whether they kick it or not, because it has still skewed my time.

Single nib good

A: Counter Interpretation: Debaters may run a single Necessary but Insufficient Burden

B: Standards

1) Aff Flex – My opponent's interpretation hurts aff flexibility because it restricts the number of strategic options the aff can run. My interp preserves aff flex because it gives access to greater argument diversity. There is an empirically verified negative win skew because of neg time advantage and flexibility in picking a case to answer the AC. Aff flexibility is therefore key to fairness as it provides for more options in the round so affirmative strategies can better mitigate negative structural advantages.

2) Philosophical Ground – Many moral philosophies such as deontology rely on necessary but insufficient burdens. In deontology, an action that violates rights would be immoral while an action that didn't wouldn't be considered moral. Hence, limiting this philosophical ground would be unfair because it is key aff/neg ground on certain resolutions. It also hurts education because it excludes discussion about normatively relevant issues.

D: Fairness

Multiple nibs bad

A) Interpretations – both debaters must run necessary and sufficient burdens

B) Violation – the aff/neg runs multiple necessary but insufficient burdens

C) Standards –

1) Time Skew – Running multiple NIBs skews my time because I have to spend time responding to any arguments that link to them and they can just kick them in the next speech. Time skew links to fairness because it puts me at a structural disadvantage in the round.

2) Reciprocal burdens - NIBs require that I fulfill them or lose. However even after fulfilling them I merely break even and I still have to prove the resolution true/false. Thus I have two burdens to prove while my opponent has one. A lack reciprocal burdens is unfair because it makes it impossible for the other side to win.

3) No risk - Necessary but insufficient burdens set up a no risk situation for my opponent. Either I

- a. Fulfill the burden, and break even, or
- b. Ignore the burden, and lose.

Regardless of what I do, I lose. No risk issues are unfair because they provide an inherent advantage to my opponent, and uneducational because they discourage debate on substantive arguments

4) Time skew - when I fulfill a necessary but insufficient burden I only break even which means the time I am forced to spend on the burden is meaningless. This skew is unfair because it gives an advantage to one side and is uneducational because I can't make substantial arguments.

5) Turn ground - When I fulfill a necessary but insufficient burden I only break even which means I cannot turn them. Turn ground is essential for fairness, because without them I cannot generate offense.

6) Strategy skew - Because my opponent is running multiple no-risk issues, regardless of the amount of arguments I make he/she can just go for the one I undercovered. I can't develop a coherent strategy because I can't predict what my opponent will go for in his/her next speech. Strategy is key to fairness because it determines how we make arguments that will help us, and my opponent's multiple NIBs prevent me from doing this. It is also key to education because strategy is what allows us generates substantive arguments.

7) Real world applicability - Necessary but insufficient burdens are not real world applicable because they lack a real impact. A lack of an impact means that we cannot compare impacts, a critical aspect of real life decision-making. Real world decision-making has the strongest internal link to education.

The scope of negative fiat and the logic of decision making. L. Paul Strait George Mason University and Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren't the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day besides breathing. Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making

are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.

D) Voters

Impact-exclusive standards Bad

A. Interpretation – consequentialist standards must include all consequentialist impacts.

B. Violation –

C. Standards –

1. **Internal link consistency** – impact-exclusive standards harm internal link consistency because they contradict their moral bases. They presuppose a utilitarian calculus but then limit impacts to only one thing, which is not reflective of the way utilitarianism actually works. Internal link consistency is key to fairness because I can only weigh and compare arguments on a broad scale when internal links align with the larger focus. My ability to execute this strategy determines my ability to win the round, so when I can't do it then I'm placed at an unfair disadvantage. Internal link consistency also fosters education because we gain a better understanding of ethical concepts when they are applied in a consistent manner.

2. **Reciprocal impact ground** – impact-exclusive standards harm reciprocal impact ground because they make it impossible for me to generate consequentialist offense that links into the standard. They can then choose a standard that is easy for them to generate links to, but any arguments that I would make linking into a utilitarian calculus would ostensibly have no impact upon the round. If the standard includes all consequentialist impacts, then we can both make and weigh similar impacts to determine the round. Reciprocal impact ground is key to fairness as impacts determine our ability to garner offense that could win us the round, so one side is placed at a disadvantage by being allotted less impact ground.

3. **Strategy distortion** – impact-exclusive standards skew the importance of the internal link, therefore skewing the size of their impacts. Eric Palmer explains:

Eric Palmer. "Truth, Comparison, and Justification in LD Debate." *Victory Briefs Daily*. April 15, 2008. <http://victorybriefsdaily.com/2008/04/15/truth-comparison-and-justification-in-ld-debate/>

Oftentimes debaters will present warrants for a standard which are in truth, impacts to another standard which they are taking for granted. For example, consider a negative case which makes the following claims: (1) oppression can lead to genocide, genocide is bad, so the criterion is preventing oppression, (2) affirming allows the construction of threats, which stifles some criticism of the state; (3) not being able to criticize the state is a form of oppression. **Given the supposition that sometimes oppression does lead to genocide, this NC is able to warrant the criterion "preventing oppression."** This in turn allows the negative to win off of the tiniest link to oppression, even if that form of oppression is probably not sufficient to lead to genocide, which is the real reason why we are supposed to be worried about oppression in the first place, according to this case. **This is clearly a bad result: what this case has done is smuggled in a link to genocide which has virtually no probability of occurring.**

Because they separated the high-impact link story justifying their standard from their contention-level arguments, any link is sufficient to get the really important consequentialist impact from the standard. Forcing them to weigh their impacts against other consequentialist impacts allows probability to play a role in determining size of impact. Strategy distortion destroys fairness because it prevents me from using options like weighing or disads due to their ability to escape these arguments. It also harms education because

A. in the real world, we must take probability and magnitude into account simultaneously to gain accurate understandings of the world

And B. because I have limited options for effective argumentation, I cannot make as high-quality responses. This decreases clash and therefore harms the potential benefits that we could gain from the round in terms of critical-thinking skills.

4. Ground: If the negative can only impact back to a hyper-specific standard, they lose all ground that does not specifically link to the standard. If the aff standard is minimizing terrorism, the neg loses all ground linking to genocide or slavery, although they both are consequentialist impacts. Forcing them to accept all consequential impacts linked to their standard solves because it expands ground until it is more reciprocal. Ground is key to fairness because debaters need to be able to access offensive arguments in order to win the ballot, and if one side is prevented from doing this then that puts them at an unfair disadvantage. Impact ground is also key to education because we lose the critical thinking involved in weighing impacts as well as the research involved in developing big-impact positions if certain impact ground is excluded.

5. Neg flexibility: The aff has the advantage of picking the advocacy, framing the debate and thus establishing the basis for central argumentation. Thus, the affirmative has the substantive advantage going into the round because the aff gets to introduce the interpretation of the resolution most advantageous to the aff, preventing the neg from generating offense linking to the aff standard. Allowing the neg greater access to consequential impacts checks back this unfairness because the neg can then generate relevant consequentialist offense. Neg flexibility is key to fairness because it balances the offset of competitive equity created by the aff ability to establish the grounds of the debate.

6. Real-world decision making: limiting impacts to one impact-exclusive standard is not reflective of how real-world decisions operate. Allowing me to make other consequentialist impacts better models real world decision-making because policymakers never focus their attention on hyper-specific problems when other impacts could be relevant to their consideration. Paul Strait (George Mason University) and Brett Wallace explain (George Washington University). "The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making." WFU Debater's Research Guide. 2007.

<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/2007/The%20Scope%20of%20Negative%20Fiat%20and%20the%20Logic%20of%20Decision%20Making.pdf>

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or **debate, is the key** still. **It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends all boundaries between categories of learning like “policy education” and “kritik education,” it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication** for this analysis **is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While policy comparison skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills are useless if they are not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.**

Real-world policy-making reinforces critical thinking and argumentative skills that will last all our lives, educational benefits that debate can uniquely provide.

File Name

res

172

Stuyvesant AE
Page 131/

*****Chapter 9: paradigms*******Tabula rasa good**

1. It prevents judge biases from interfering with the outcome of the debate, since the judge must let the debaters' argumentation determine her views on the issues discussed in the round. Judge biases are unfair because the debaters have no choice over what sides they have to debate, so if the judge is partial to one side then this randomly puts the other side at an unfair disadvantage.

2. It holds debaters to a higher standard of argumentation because they can no longer rely on the fact that judges will just assume some basic statements are true. This creates educational benefits because

A. debaters will consider the premises behind statements that they typically take for granted, enabling them to explore ethical and epistemological issues that previously would have gone unnoticed

And B. analyzing the missing warrants behind even simple statements fosters critical thinking and argumentation skills.

3. It allows for greater creativity of argumentation because debaters do not need to worry about whether their judge will *like* the argument, they only need to be able to defend it. Creative argumentation provides for unique educational benefits, as topics last for two months and debates on the exact same issues every round eventually cease to teach any new information or strategic skills.

4. It models real world policymaking because the public is, as a whole, relatively moderate in political views. Policymakers must make some effort to win over completely moderate, relatively unbiased voters in addition to their bases, since political parties do not tend to hold majorities among the US voting population. Tabula rasa therefore gives debaters experience in making and understanding policy decisions.

5. It gives debaters the ability to have control over their own round, allowing for the most educational and fair debate as debaters can have self-ownership over the activity. Self-ownership is important because it amplifies the educational effects of debate. People are more willing to devote time and effort to an activity when they see it as something they can have an impact on.

6. It creates greater civic responsibility because debaters become more skeptical of unwarranted argumentation. They do not merely accept community norms for what they are, but instead use comparison of justifications to evaluate the values of those norms.

Tabula Rasa Bad

1. It's logically inconsistent. Eric Palmer explains:

Eric Palmer. "Truth, Comparison, and Justification in LD Debate." *Victory Briefs Daily*. April 15, 2008.

<http://victorybriefsdaily.com/2008/04/15/truth-comparison-and-justification-in-ld-debate/>

One parting thought: some have suggested that there is no reason to have a comprehensive theory of LD because part of what is best in debate is that students are able to challenge assumptions about what standards should be used to evaluate arguments. I am partly sympathetic to this point: it seems like debaters ought to be able to argue in-round that any judge should set aside some aspect of their default paradigm in order to make space for some particularly unusual sort of argument (a performance, for example). It is problematic, however, to suppose that we could get by without any fundamental picture of how arguments should be evaluated at all. How could judges evaluate a debater's reasons for adopting a different paradigm for the purposes of a round at all without taking for granted certain assumptions about how arguments ought to be understood? At root, debate is a social practice which is constituted by the norms we choose. If no norms remain fixed, if there are no rules for the game at all, then judges would have no resources to use in evaluating proposals to adopt new norms. Judges must take some principles for granted when they approach rounds, and reflection is needed to determine what exactly those principles should be.

Judges must make certain assumptions about argumentation in order to accept any argumentation, even that which suggests a new paradigm for the judge. This renders tabula rasa logically inconsistent because judges must violate the judging strategy in order to execute it.

2. It encourages sloppy argumentation because debaters know that they can get away with untrue or unwarranted arguments as long as their opponents do not point out their errors. This leads to blippy spreads or blatantly unwarranted arguments which are uneducational because they do not even attempt to preserve some modicum of detail.

3. Judges must have some default paradigm anyway. The logical extension of tab judging is that debaters should establish the judge's paradigm, but if neither debater makes an effort to do so then the judge must still have some way to evaluate the round. This means that tab is insufficient to serve as a judging strategy.

4. It's impossible for judges to entirely eliminate their own biases when evaluating the round, but tabula rasa judging pretends that this is viable. This strategy is problematic because it prevents judges from revealing their biases up-front. This is unfair because then debaters don't even know about the biases they face and have no way of compensating for them. Moreover, it is uneducational because a valuable lesson learned from debate is the ability to convince someone to overcome their personal biases, but this is impossible if judges hide behind the guise of being "tab."

File Name

res

172

Stuyvesant AE
Page 134/

offense-defense > truth-testing

A. Interpretation – Both debaters must adhere to the offense-defense paradigm: the aff must defend an advocacy, the neg must defend not doing that advocacy or doing some competitive advocacy, and the judge chooses between the two sides on the basis of reasons provided in the debate.

B. Their arguments only relate to the resolution's truth or falsity, not the preferability of their advocacy over mine.

C. Standards –

1) **Presumption** – truth-testing makes it much easier to presume neg than aff, because the neg can just claim that the aff has the burden to prove the resolution true and in the absence of offense you should negate. Offense-defense solves this problem by eliminating the need for presumption, since there will always be a *risk* of offense on either side. Presumption toward one side is unfair because this puts the other side at a structural disadvantage going into the round. It's also uneducational because it encourages defense-only strategies because the neg knows that defense is sufficient for them to win off presumption.

2) **Reciprocal impact ground** – truth-testing explodes neg counterplan ground because the neg can run a counterplan that is not net-beneficial and still win, as long as they prove that consequentialism must choose the *best* action. This means any counterplan that has exactly the same benefits and impacts as the aff plan is acceptable, vastly widening the range of counterplan options to choose from. Offense-defense solves this problem by forcing the neg to defend an advocacy that is preferable and not simply similar to the aff plan. Reciprocal impact ground is key to fairness because impacts are how both sides generate offense that lets them win the round, so if one side has a greater ability to make impacts going into the round, then this gives them an unfair advantage.

3) **Clash** – truth-testing discourages clash because negative strategies don't need to be relevant to the aff strategy to win. As long as the neg disproves the resolution, this disapproval needs no relation to the aff's attempts to prove the resolution true. Truth Testing encourages defense only strategies. Defense is sufficient to prove a statement false, which reduces debates to defense only strategies with no direct comparison or clash. Offense-defense necessitates clash because each side must prove why their advocacy is preferable to the other's advocacy. Clash is key to education because it teaches critical thinking and argumentation skills.

4) **Real world decision-making** – truth-testing allows for skepticism arguments without significant impacts on the grounds that they have truth value. This harms real world decision-making because in real life we do not let arguments impact our decisions unless they have some form of tangible impact.

Offense-defense solves this by forcing people to draw impacts from skepticism if they want to run skeptical positions. Real world decision-making is the most important benefit we get from debate because debate primarily teaches us how to make effective decisions, so it provides the strongest link to education.

5) **Neg Bias:** Truth testing increases neg bias because the Neg has a significant time advantage and only has to prove one example in which the resolution is false and they win. Offense-defense solves this because it allows arguments to be weighed against each other, this allows the AC to leverage offense vs. neg examples. This is key to fairness because without a protection of the AFF it would be impossible to affirm and destroy the competitive equity of debate

D.

PolicyMaking > Truth-testing

- A. Interpretation** – The affirmative must defend a specific policy action or plan and the negative must contest that plan by demonstrating an opportunity cost or explicit cost to the plan, then both debaters must compare the costs and benefits of the plan.
- B.** The negative presumes that the resolution is a statement of truth and attempts to prove that statement false

C. Standards –

1. **Real world decision-making** – decision-makers in the real world do not act off statements of truth; instead, they act off what they determine they should do. Policymaking better provides for real world decision-making by forcing us to advocate policy actions and actively engage each others' advocacies rather than just responding to the truth of the resolution. Real world decision-making has the strongest link to education because the ability to make effective decisions is the most lasting and important skill gained through debating.

2. **Aff flex** – truth-testing prevents the aff from establishing the terms of the debate because the neg can independently prove the resolution false regardless of the aff advocacy. Policymaking solves this problem by forcing the neg to engage the aff advocacy rather than the entire resolution. Aff flex prevents time skew because

A. the aff has to speak first, so when the neg does not engage the aff advocacy this renders six minutes of aff time irrelevant and creates a time skew that cannot be recoverable.

B. the neg has an automatic advantage because they have more time to respond to the aff case and cover both sides of the round, placing the aff at a structural time disadvantage going into the round.

Time skew kills fairness because the time that we have establishes an upper limit on the number and quality of arguments we can make, so when one side has more time to respond, this gives that side an unfair advantage.

3. **Depth of discussion** – truth-testing promotes a shallow discussion of resolutinal issues because the aff must scramble to prove all parts of the resolution true. Policymaking solves this back by allowing the aff to focus on a specific plan and provide specific research and arguments in support. Depth of discussion is key to education because we gain nothing from a debate quickly spanning lots of issues, while we are more likely to learn new information from a specified plan.

D.

Best justification > truth-testing

A. Interpretation – The affirmative must prove that the resolution is better justified than the converse of the resolution and the negative must prove that the converse of the resolution is better justified than the resolution through a comparison of reasons.

B. The affirmative/negative views the resolution as a statement of truth attempts to prove the resolution true/false

C. Standards –

1. **Argument quality** – truth-testing encourages tenuous “a priori” arguments because one weak reason why the resolution is false is sufficient to negate, but best-justification allows for comparison on basis of argument quality. Eric Palmer explains

Eric Palmer. “Truth, Comparison, and Justification in LD Debate.” *Victory Briefs Daily*. April 15, 2008. <http://victorybriefsdaily.com/2008/04/15/truth-comparison-and-justification-in-ld-debate/>

For one, truth-testing generates the problem of wayward “pre-standards” arguments. If, for instance, some argument which claims that the resolution is self-contradictory is dropped, truth-testing requires a negative verdict because the dropped argument entails the falsity of the resolution. On the best justification picture, however, the fact that the dropped argument entails the falsity of the resolution merely provides some evidence that a belief in the resolution is unjustified. How strong that evidence is depends on how strong the dropped argument was. If the argument was particularly well-developed, this may warrant a negation, but if the argument was a mangled blip, then it may be better to hold that the arguments developed by the affirmative are sufficient to justify the resolution’s truth in spite of the drop.

Best-justification promotes fairness because negs can no longer make big-impact a priori arguments without taking sufficient time to warrant them, whereas truth-testing allows shallow argumentation to win the round as long as it is not sufficiently dealt with. This also promotes education because higher argument quality necessitates more research and elaboration.

2. **Clash** – truth-testing allows the neg to win independent of engaging the aff advocacy, since it's sufficient just to disprove the resolution. Best-justification solves this because the neg must still be comparative in order to show why their arguments are better justified than the aff's. Clash is key to education because actively engaging the other side's arguments teaches critical thinking and communication skills.

3. **Offense-defense distinction** – truth-testing allows the neg to win independent of offense, since they just need to disprove the resolution in order to negate. Best-justification solves this problem because it requires that both sides justify their positions. Eric Palmer explains:

Eric Palmer. “Truth, Comparison, and Justification in LD Debate.” *Victory Briefs Daily*. April 15, 2008. <http://victorybriefsdaily.com/2008/04/15/truth-comparison-and-justification-in-ld-debate/>

Another advantage of the best justification paradigm over traditional truth-testing is that it preserves something like the offense/defense distinction employed in Policy. If the negative is not providing proactive reasons for thinking that the resolution has got to be false, then there is no reason not to accept the affirmative's argumentation. The same more or less holds true for particular arguments. An argument may provide a good justification for some claim even if there are standing reasons for thinking that argument might be false in the event that the initial justification is more powerful than the reasons standing against it.

Offense-defense distinction is key to fairness because otherwise, the aff must generate offense and defense while the neg just has to generate defense. This explodes the aff's argumentation burden and places them at an unfair disadvantage, since generating defense is much easier than generating offense. Offense-defense also fosters education since it teaches us to make a variety of arguments, and the ability to think quickly and make varied argumentation is a skill that we can use later in life.

Offense-Defense > Policy Making

Interpretation: Both debaters must adhere to the offense-defense paradigm: the aff must defend an advocacy, the neg must defend not doing that advocacy or doing some competitive advocacy, and the judge chooses between the two sides on the basis of reasons provided in the debate.

Violation: My opponent proposes a course of action and defends this course of action as the way to affirm/negate the resolution.

1. **Theory** – Theory has no ballot story under policy making as an unfair plan or cp could still be an ideal policy. This creates a race to the bottom, as absent an external check on unfair arguments, it is most strategic to be as theoretically illegitimate as possible. This also prevents any attempt to preserve fair or educational debate. Offense Defense solves, because theory is an advocacy if it generates uniqueness through the interpretation and a link through the violation
2. **Philosophy** – Policy making ignores the significance of philosophically relevant positions as all policy decisions are grounded in utilitarianism. Two implications follow. One, this is uneducational as it disincentivizes people from learning about important moral philosophies such as deontology. Two, this is unfair because it arbitrarily excludes moral philosophies which are crucial ground for both sides. OD solves since any moral theory is viable so long as it has an offensive implication.
3. **Research Burdens** – Because policy making is a plan focused paradigm it gives the neg an infinite research burden because there are an endless number of plans for the aff to choose from. Reciprocal research burdens are key to fairness because unresearched arguments will be qualitatively worse than researched arguments. The ability for my opponent to research more effectively than me is unfair as /she'll have better arguments, and it is easier to win if you have access better arguments. Political relevance and topicality don't prove that the plan is predictable because the political arena is so vast that there are still an unresearchable number of plans the aff could pick from AND a plan can still have a massive impact but be grounded in post-modern philosophy. Also, Offense Defense solves because all of my arguments are relevant in relation to the plan so any research I do can be leveraged against my opponent's advocacy.

Best Justification > Policy Making

- A. **Interpretation** – The affirmative must prove that the resolution is better justified than the converse of the resolution and the negative must prove that the converse of the resolution is better justified than the resolution through a comparison of reasons.
- B. **Violation:** My opponent proposes a course of action and defends this course of action as the way to affirm/negate the resolution.
- C. **Standards**

1. **Theory** – Theory has no ballot story under policy making as an unfair plan or cp could still be an ideal policy. This creates a race to the bottom as absent an external check to unfair arguments, it is most strategic to be as theoretically illegitimate as possible. This also prevents any attempt to preserve fair or educational debate. Best Justification solves because unfair arguments skew substance so that objective evaluations of truth are impossible. Theory then becomes a justification which denies the truth or falsity of an advocacy which would outweigh the justifications to believe the truth or falsity of an illegitimate advocacy.
2. **Philosophy** – Policy making ignores the significance of philosophically relevant positions as policy decisions are grounded in utilitarianism. Two implications follow. One, this is uneducational as it disincentivizes people from learning about important moral philosophies such as deontology. Two, this is unfair because it arbitrarily excludes moral philosophies which are crucial ground for both sides. Best Justification solves since any moral theory is viable so long as it provides a justification to believe the truth or falsity of an advocacy.
3. **Research Burdens** – Because policy making is a plan focused paradigm it gives the neg an infinite research burden because there are an endless number of plans for the aff to choose from. Reciprocal research burdens are key to fairness because unresearched arguments will be qualitatively worse than researched arguments. The ability for my opponent to research more effectively than me is unfair as /she'll have better arguments, and it is easier to win if you have access better arguments. Political relevance and topicality don't prove that the plan is predictable because the political arena is so vast that there are still an unresearchable number of plans the aff could pick from AND a plan can still have a massive impact but be grounded in post-modern philosophy. Also, Best Justifications solves because all of my arguments are relevant as counter justifications to the plan so any research I do can be leveraged against my opponent's advocacy.

Truth Testing > Policy Making

The affirmative must prove the resolution true and the negative must prove the resolution false

B. Violation- My opponent argues that we should compare the desirability of the affirmative policy to the status quo or an alternative world

C. Standards

1. Division of Ground- Truth testing divides the ground equally such that the affirmative may defend anything that proves the resolution true and the negative must prove the resolution false. Allowing the affirmative to specify a policy action allows the aff to choose the best ground on the topic and forces the negative to contest that ground, which is unfair because the affirmative is granted the ability to only advocate the best argument on the topic, which makes it more difficult for the negative to win.

2. Predictability- The aff can never predict what alternative policy the negative will defend, which is unfair because

First: The aff will always be less prepared to answer negative counter plans than the neg will be to defend them and

Second: Because the aff cannot predict the negative strategy they cannot use AC speech time to pre-empt the NC so they can never be as directly responsive to the neg as the aff as the neg has thirteen minutes to respond to negative speech time whereas the aff only has 7, which allows the negative to better engage the affirmative and gives the neg a greater chance of winning. My interpretation solves because the aff can always preempt common arguments used to prove the resolution false, whereas there is not a degree of genericness under a policy making paradigm because the negative has literally infinite ground.

3. Research Burdens – Because policy making is a plan focused paradigm it gives the neg an infinite research burden because there are an endless number of plans for the aff to choose from. Reciprocal research burdens are key to fairness because unresearched arguments will be qualitatively worse than researched arguments. The ability for my opponent to research more effectively than me is unfair as /she'll have better arguments, and it is easier to win if you have access better arguments. Political relevance and topicality don't prove that the plan is predictable because the political arena is so vast that there are still an unresearchable number of plans the aff could pick from AND a plan can still have a massive impact but be grounded in post-modern philosophy. Also, Truth Testing solves because it is resolutionally focused. The implication is that the aff can no longer parametrize to run a plan which makes all my research relevant as all neg arguments become counter-examples which engage the aff advocacy.

D. Impact- Fairness

Truth-testing > Offense-defense

A. Interpretation- The affirmative must prove the resolution true and the negative must prove the resolution false

B. Violation- My opponent argues the aff must defend an advocacy, the neg must defend not doing that advocacy or doing some competitive advocacy, and the judge chooses between the two sides on the basis of reasons provided in the debate.

C. Standards

1. Division of Ground- Truth testing divides the ground equally such that the affirmative may defend anything that proves the resolution true and the negative must prove the resolution false. Allowing the affirmative to specify an advocacy allows the aff to choose the best ground on the topic and forces the negative to contest that ground, which is unfair because the affirmative is granted the ability to only advocate the best argument on the topic, which makes it more difficult for the negative to win.

2. Predictability- The aff can never predict what alternative advocacy the negative will defend, which is unfair because

First: The aff will always be less prepared to answer negative counter advocacies than the neg will be to defend them and

Second: Because the aff cannot predict the negative strategy they cannot use AC speech time to pre-empt the NC so they can never be as directly responsive to the neg as the aff as the neg has thirteen minutes to respond to negative speech time whereas the aff only has 7, which allows the negative to better engage the affirmative and gives the neg a greater chance of winning. My interpretation solves because the aff can always preempt common arguments used to prove the resolution false, whereas there is not a degree of genericness under a policy making paradigm because the negative has literally infinite ground.

3. Reciprocal Burdens: Under Offense Defense, the affirmative burden is to show an offensive, comparative advantage to the aff advocacy. The neg burden is to provide a competitive advocacy OR defend the status quo and then prove an offensive, comparative advantage to the neg advocacy. This gives the neg two sufficient burdens which provides them with two ways to access offense, whereas the aff has only one way to access offense. Under truth testing, the aff burden is to prove the resolution true whereas the negative burden is to prove the resolution false so the burdens are reciprocal.

Philosophy: Offense Defense excludes ethical theories that deny the truth of normativity. Two implications follow. One, this is uneducational as it disincentivizes people from learning about important moral philosophies such as skepticism. Two, this is unfair because it arbitrarily excludes moral philosophies which are crucial ground for both sides. Truth Testing solves as ethical theories that deny normativity are reasons to believe the resolution is false.

Best Justification > Offense-defense

A. Interpretation – The affirmative must prove that the resolution is better justified than the converse of the resolution and the negative must prove that the converse of the resolution is better justified than the resolution through a comparison of reasons.

Violation- My opponent argues the aff must defend an advocacy, the neg must defend not doing that advocacy or doing some competitive advocacy, and the judge chooses between the two sides on the basis of reasons provided in the debate.

1. **Philosophy:** Offense Defense excludes ethical theories that deny the truth of normativity. Two implications follow. One, this is uneducational as it disincentivizes people from learning about important moral philosophies such as skepticism. Two, this is unfair because it arbitrarily excludes moral philosophies which are crucial ground for both sides. Best Justification solves by letting advocacies be run as long as there are reasons as to why they are important.
2. **Clash:** OD doesn't necessitate clash so long as one person proves that they are getting more offense than their opponent is. This is uneducational as debate teaches us how to make actual comparisons in the real world. In the real world, we must use direct comparison of competing options to arrive at a conclusion, which OD doesn't necessitate or encourage. Moreover, OD discourages clash because the time spent is an opportunity cost to trying to access additional impacts. Best Justification solves as "best" is necessarily a comparative term so we are forced to compare justifications which ensures clash.

policy making > best justification

- A. **Interpretation** – The affirmative must defend a specific policy action or plan and the negative must contest that plan by demonstrating an opportunity cost or explicit cost to the plan, then both debaters must compare the costs and benefits of the plan.
- B. My opponent argues that the affirmative must prove that the resolution is better justified than the converse of the resolution and the negative must prove that the converse of the resolution is better justified than the resolution through a comparison of reasons.
- C. The standard is real world decision making.

Policy making is the closest analogue to real world decision making, as we use debate to make decisions. Decisions are arrived at by comparing differing options. Real-world decision-making is the most important form of education.

Strait and Wallace² write,

The ability to make decisions deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the **key skill**. It is the one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives besides breathing. Decision-making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like "policy education" and "kritik education," it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain. The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are conductively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives.

My link to education will always be stronger because policy making is an empirical form of real world decision making whereas best justification is a nebulous concept that only vaguely applies to how we make decisions.

² L. Paul Strait (George Mason University) and Brett Wallace (George Washington University). "The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making." WFU Debater's Research Guide. 2007.
[<http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/2007/The%20Scope%20of%20Negative%20Fiat%20and%20the%20Logic%20of%20Decision%20Making.pdf>]

offense-defense > best justification

- A. Interpretation: Both debaters must adhere to the offense-defense paradigm: the aff must defend an advocacy, the neg must defend not doing that advocacy or doing some competitive advocacy, and the judge chooses between the two sides on the basis of reasons provided in the debate.
 - B. Violation: My opponent argues that the affirmative must prove that the resolution is better justified than the converse of the resolution and the negative must prove that the converse of the resolution is better justified than the resolution through a comparison of reasons.
-
- 1. **No risk issues-** best justification simply asks what will prove the resolution is true or false, it puts no limits on things that are theoretically illegitimate or not. It is comparable to doing that which is necessary in order to win which in this case is proving the resolution true or false through the best justifications even if those best justifications means theoretically illegitimate arguments such as a prioris. Offense defense solves for this because they do not give comparative weighing through impacts because falsity is not an impact. Preventing no risk issues is key to education because no risk issues prevent learning about the topic because falsity claims just prove how the resolution is false and therefore you don't even talk about resolution. They are unfair because they give a huge advantage to one side.
 - 2. **Theory –** Theory has no ballot story under best justification as a justification must proves the truth or falsity of the resolution. This creates a race to the bottom as absent an external check to unfair arguments, it is most strategic to be as theoretically illegitimate as possible. Since the ballot asks the judge to determine who the better debater is, the judge's primary obligation is to make this evaluation. Policy making prevents the judge from fulfilling this obligation as they will be forced to vote for the best cheater and not the best debater. Offense Defense solves because theory is an advocacy if it generates uniqueness through the interpretation and a link through the violation
 - 3. **Presuppositions-** offense defense does not presuppose plan focus or resolution focus, while best justification justifies res focus. Presuppositions are bad because they make the judge presuppose things before even going into the round. This already takes some portion of the debate out of the debater's hands and puts it into the judge's. This is bad because this leads to judge intervention even on the most minute level which will eventually lead to large scale judge intervention. This is bad for education because then the judge is making the decision of the round based on their intuition which gives no reason for either side to put forth an educational debate full of clash if it is going to come down to judge's decision anyways. Judge intervention is also not fair to both debaters because it makes the round based on the arbitrary yet justified decision of the judge.

Aff framework choice good cards

The AFF has a Right to Be the One who Sets up the Framework In the Round

O'Donnell (Timothy, And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate" Timothy M. O'Donnellⁱ Director of Debate University of Mary Washington)

In this light, AFC may even be viewed as a “right” similar to the affirmative’s right to define. Although there are several reasons why the affirmative ought to have the right to define, the most persuasive justification recognizes that with the responsibility of initiating the discussion on the resolutional question comes a concomitant right to offer an interpretation of what those words mean. Of course, it is not an exclusive right because the negative can always challenge the interpretations. Nevertheless, the affirmative’s interpretation carries a certain presumption that is accepted as “good for debate” unless proven otherwise. The rationale for AFC follows a similar line of thinking. The affirmative should be able to choose the question for the debate because they are required to speak first.

AFF Choice Ensures Competitive Equity

O'Donnell (Timothy, And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate" Timothy M. O'Donnellⁱⁱ Director of Debate University of Mary Washington)

Second, AFC ensures competitive equity. Leaving the framework open to debate puts the affirmative at a significant competitive disadvantage. When the negative has the option of changing, or even initiating, the framework discussion, the first affirmative constructive speech is rendered meaningless. This hurts the affirmative for two reasons. First, it gives the negative a two-to-one advantage in constructive speech time for making framework arguments. Second, the first affirmative framework choice (or lack thereof) locks the affirmative into defending their opening speech act against an entirely different framework from the one it was designed to address. Not only does AFC solve these problems, it also gives every debater an opportunity to have debates in the framework of their choosing. Allowing the first affirmative constructive speech to set the terms for the debate ensures that teams get to choose to debate in their framework half of the time. For example, if one team wanted to have a policy debate, AFC would allow them to do so when they are affirmative. Similarly, if another team wanted to have a performance debate, AFC would give them a similar opportunity when they are affirmative. This means that every team would have an equal opportunity to have fulfilling and engaging debates on the issues they choose to discuss half the time.

AFF Choice Increases Education and Argument Development

O'Donnell (Timothy, And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate" Timothy M. O'Donnellⁱⁱⁱ Director of Debate University of Mary Washington)

Third, AFC has substantial educational benefits. To begin with, it would force teams to debate in multiple frameworks. Too few teams at both the high school and college level have true argument flexibility. It is an undeniable fact that the debate enterprise would be a more educational undertaking for all involved if teams had to prepare to debate a variety of different frameworks. AFC solves this problem because the framework, like the case, would be determined at the beginning of the debate. Unfortunately, in a world where the question of the debate is not resolved prior to the start of the debate, teams simply pick the framework that they want to defend and advocate it on both the affirmative and the negative. When the negative is permitted to shift the framework, affirmative teams are denied the opportunity to debate in the framework that they selected. Ceding framework selection to the affirmative creates a permanent space for the exploration of multiple frameworks. Indeed, it would allow them to flourish. The fact of the matter is that the creativity which stands behind the wide variety of argument strategies in contemporary debate ensures that a diverse set of frameworks would continue to be explored. AFC aims to break the idea that teams should debate only one way. Instead, it empowers alternate perspectives on debate and gives each an equal footing. In addition, AFC would have the educational benefit of promoting argument development. If widely accepted, it would have the effect of bracketing framework

discussions. Such a move would necessarily focus the debate on issues germane to the framework selected by the affirmative. This would provide more time to explore these issues in greater complexity. Recall for a moment many of the diverse negative strategies deployed at the 2004 NDT. Now ask, how much more intellectually rewarding would those debates have been if the framework discussions were removed from consideration? AFC creates a situation where this is possible.

Aff Choice Ensures Competitive Equity in Rounds

O'Donnell (Timothy, And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate" Timothy M. O'Donnell^{iv} Director of Debate University of Mary Washington)

Fourth, AFC creates a compromise that allows different perspectives on the question of the debate to coexist. The problem with leaving the framework open to debate is that it makes a schism in the community inevitable. Such a split, if it were to happen, would have serious long term consequences for the existence of competitive debate. Unfortunately, the history of intercollegiate debate is a history marked by fissures that have seen groups of like minded people peel away from the larger community because of their disagreements about what counts as excellence in debate.^v This process has happened before and it is likely to happen again. Indeed, I suspect that it is already underway as one or more pockets lament the seeming intransigence of their competitive counterparts in coming around to their perspective on what the activity of debate ought to be about. AFC is a compromise position that gives everyone an equal stake in the game.

AFF Choice Puts The Round In the hands of the Debater, not the Judge

O'Donnell (Timothy, And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate" Timothy M. O'Donnell^{vi} Director of Debate University of Mary Washington)

Finally, AFC, if widely accepted, has the potential to change the nature of judging and would put debating back into the hands of the debaters. If one considers the wide variety of claims that judges today make in their judging philosophies about what they will and will not tolerate, it is clear that there are significant cleavages in the judging pool. The reason for this is that judges (my self included) have different dispositions toward the question of the debate and they are often willing to impose those views in the debate in a variety of ways. AFC envisions a situation in which judges could mutually agree to disarm.

AFF choice Does Not mean That the NEG cannot Question Framework

O'Donnell (Timothy, And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate" Timothy M. O'Donnell^{vii} Director of Debate University of Mary Washington)

Would AFC mean the negative could never question affirmative assumptions? There are at least two answers to this objection. First, not necessarily. The negative would still have ground to critique the assumptions embedded in the framework advocated by the affirmative team. For example, if the affirmative advocated ceding political control in Iraq to the United Nations through a policy framework, the negative could still question all of the policy assumptions which speak to the plan's desirability. AFC only constrains the negative to the extent that they are limited to the starting point selected by the affirmative. This means that the negative would be forced to bracket questions regarding the desirability of the affirmative with respect to its language, its representations, its politics, its performance, its philosophy, etc. Similarly, if the affirmative advocated ceding political control in Iraq to the United Nations through a performance framework, the negative could question all of the assumptions behind their performance in addition to topically derived core negative arguments (although those arguments would have to be adapted to the framework advanced by the affirmative). In such situations, ground loss would be minimal because the ground that the negative loses would not be germane to either the resolutionally derived question or the affirmative framework. Thus the only thing that the negative loses under AFC is the ability to shift the question of the debate through critiques of the affirmative framework. Viewed this way, the negative's complaint is that they don't get to talk about everything but the affirmative. But why should they?

File Name

res

172

Stuyvesant AE

Page 148/

Even If Ground is Lost by AFF choice, The Benefits Would Outweigh any Disadvantages

O'Donnell (Timothy, And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate" Timothy M. O'Donnell^{viii} Director of Debate University of Mary Washington)

Second, the benefits gained by adoption of AFC outweigh what would be lost. Limiting negative ground focuses the discussion and generates richer debates within the framework chosen by the affirmative. There is no substantial benefit to allowing the negative to question every assumption since the emergence of critical affirmatives ensures a place at the table for these types of arguments.

NEGs do not have a Right to Question Everything, Infinite Prep for the AFF is a Myth

O'Donnell (Timothy, And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate" Timothy M. O'Donnell^{ix} Director of Debate University of Mary Washington)

Third, the negative does not have a right to question every assumption. Infinite preparation time for the affirmative is a myth. Affirmative teams, only have a fixed amount of time to prepare to debate. If they are forced to defend any and all assumptions that they are heir to by virtue of their existence at the end of thousands of years of human civilization there is no reasonable expectation that they could ever be prepared to debate. The number and range of questions that the debate could be about is certainly much greater than the amount of time the affirmative has to prepare. Such a situation is anathema to any cooperative learning enterprise. If learning is to be maximized, participants must have a reasonable expectation about what to prepare for. This is, after all, why everyone who participates in two-person "policy" debate thinks there ought to be a topic. Yet, while we seem to agree that there should be limits placed on the affirmative, the same thinking does not always seem to apply to the negative. AFC merely recognizes that both sides need to give something up to have a debate.

AFF choice Would Not Tip the Balance in the AFF's Favor

O'Donnell (Timothy, And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate" Timothy M. O'Donnell^x Director of Debate University of Mary Washington)

Would AFC tip the balance too much in the affirmative's favor? This is potentially the most serious objection to the proposal advanced here. After all, why wouldn't an affirmative advocate a framework that made it impossible for the negative to win? The short answer is that some affirmatives might try. However, this charge is not unique to the proposal contained herein. The affirmative already has free reign to introduce a framework for evaluating the debate, and many of them do. Furthermore, while the risk of creating a competitive imbalance in favor of the affirmative might seem likely, this criticism is more hypothetical than real. The same communal notions that have generally served to limit affirmative case selection with respect to topicality could also function with AFC. Of course, negative teams would have to be prepared to argue that the framework presented by the affirmative is untenable for competitive and/or educational reasons. But, this is no different than what they already prepare to do with topicality. There is a reason why the vast majority of teams do not run the best affirmatives from past topics year after year. Negative teams are more often than not, able to easily defeat those affirmatives with topicality arguments. Why? Because virtually every participant in the game has an intuitive sense that we must reach stasis to even have a debate. AFC merely carries that notion one step further by recognizing that to have a debate we must agree on both the topic and the question that the judge seeks to resolve with respect to that topic.

Comparative worlds good

Comparative Worlds Approach Maintains Flexibility For Both Debaters

Nelson 08 (Adam F. JD, Director of Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Mock Trial at The Harker School, San Jose, CA. I would like to thank Michael Mangus, whose writings provided the basis for many of these ideas, Ryan Lawrence, who convinced me to adopt my current view of the value/criterion model and whose late-night conversations at VBI first got me thinking about alternative approaches to LD, and to Cameron Baghai and Daniel Khalessi, whose final round at this season's CPS tournament provided the impetus for the writing of this article. Towards a Comprehensive Theory of Lincoln-Douglas Debate)

Instead, it seems much more reasonable to treat the resolution as a way to equitably divide ground: the affirmative advocating the desirability of a world in which people adhere to the value judgment implied by the resolution and the negative advocating the desirability of a world in which people adhere to a value judgment mutually exclusive to that implied by the resolution. By making the issue one of desirability of competing world-views rather than of truth, the affirmative gains access to increased flexibility regarding how he or she chooses to defend that world, while the negative retains equal flexibility while being denied access to those skeptical arguments indicted above. Our ability to make normative claims is irrelevant to a discussion of the desirability of making two such claims. Unless there is some significant harm in making such statements, some offensive reason to reject making them that can be avoided by an advocacy mutually exclusive with that of the affirmative such objections are not a reason the negative world is more desirable, and therefore not a reason to negate. Note this is precisely how things have been done in policy debate for some time: a team that runs a kritik is expected to offer some impact of the mindset they are indicting and some alternative that would solve for that impact. A team that simply argued some universal, unavoidable, problem was bad and therefore a reason to negate would not be very successful. It is about time LD started treating such arguments the same way.

World Comparison Requires Offensive Strategies Which Solves For Defense Spreads Under Truth Testing, Plus World Comparison Is More Intuitively True in Real World Scenarios

Nelson 08 (Adam F. JD, Director of Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Mock Trial at The Harker School, San Jose, CA. I would like to thank Michael Mangus, whose writings provided the basis for many of these ideas, Ryan Lawrence, who convinced me to adopt my current view of the value/criterion model and whose late-night conversations at VBI first got me thinking about alternative approaches to LD, and to Cameron Baghai and Daniel Khalessi, whose final round at this season's CPS tournament provided the impetus for the writing of this article. Towards a Comprehensive Theory of Lincoln-Douglas Debate)

Such a model of the resolution has additional benefits as well. First, it forces both debaters to offer offensive reasons to prefer their worldview, thereby further enforcing a parallel burden structure. This means debaters can no longer get away with arguing the resolution is by definition true or false. The "truth" of the particular vocabulary of the resolution is irrelevant to its desirability. Second, it is intuitive. When people evaluate the truth of ethical claims, they consider their implications in the real world. They ask themselves whether a world in which people live by that ethical rule is better than one in which they don't. Such debates don't happen solely in the abstract. We want to know how the various options affect us and the world we live in.

Comparative Worlds Does not Exclude Philosophy In Decision Making But Forces Direct Comparisons

Nelson 08 (Adam F. JD, Director of Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Mock Trial at The Harker School, San Jose, CA. I would like to thank Michael Mangus, whose writings provided the basis for many of these ideas, Ryan Lawrence, who convinced me to adopt my current view of the value/criterion model and whose late-night conversations at VBI first got me thinking about alternative approaches to LD, and to Cameron Baghai and Daniel Khalessi, whose final round at this season's CPS tournament provided the impetus for the writing of this article. Towards a Comprehensive Theory of Lincoln-Douglas Debate)

This does not, however, mean this "worldview comparison" model would necessarily remove the ability of debaters to argue values or philosophy in the abstract. We have long recognized that purely deontological arguments have offensive impacts that can be compared against other such implications. This model would simply require debaters to more directly compare, for example, the importance of avoiding treating people as means to an end or protecting rights with the importance of saving lives or maximizing economic efficiency, for reasons I will explore shortly.

World Comparison Forces Weighing Of Criteria

Nelson 08 (Adam F. JD, Director of Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Mock Trial at The Harker School, San Jose, CA. I would like to thank Michael Mangus, whose writings provided the basis for many of these ideas, Ryan Lawrence, who convinced me to adopt my current view of the value/criterion model and whose late-night conversations at VBI first got me thinking about alternative approaches to LD, and to Cameron Baghai and Daniel Khalessi, whose final round at this season's CPS tournament provided the impetus for the writing of this article. Towards a Comprehensive Theory of Lincoln-Douglas Debate)

Contextualizing this debate, by forcing debaters to directly compare the importance of their contentions, rather than their criteria, will provide a more intuitive, and more realistic, experience for our students. The current approach to the criterion debate allows debaters to avoid some of the most difficult, and important, questions posed by the resolution.

When a deontological standard is employed, teleological implications of the resolution become irrelevant. When a teleological standard is employed, deontological implications of the resolution become irrelevant. Yet, we consider both sides of that coin when we debate moral questions in our everyday lives. The debate is not about which is important, but about which is more important, and how much. We don't, to take a common example from this season's September/October resolution, say the number of innocents executed is irrelevant to the justness of capital punishment, seeing as it is a proportional punishment. We argue the execution of a small number of innocents, though regrettable, is not a reason to reject the death penalty entirely, given the need for a proportional punishment for murder. Shouldn't our students do the same? While such debate is, of course, possible under the current model, the worldview comparison model makes such clash necessary.

A2: Not Enough Time In Debate For Real World Discussion

Nelson 08 (Adam F. JD, Director of Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Mock Trial at The Harker School, San Jose, CA. I would like to thank Michael Mangus, whose writings provided the basis for many of these ideas, Ryan Lawrence, who convinced me to adopt my current view of the value/criterion model and whose late-night conversations at VBI first got me thinking about alternative approaches to LD, and to Cameron Baghai and Daniel Khalessi, whose final round at this season's CPS tournament provided the impetus for the writing of this article. Towards a Comprehensive Theory of Lincoln-Douglas Debate)

It seems the most likely objection to this reasoning is that there simply is not enough time to contextualize comparison of impacts in an LD round. But I think that argument is problematic for two reasons. First, I don't think contextualization of the impact debate will take significantly longer than the value/criterion debate does currently. In the examples I've given above, the contextualized comparison takes only a little more time than does the attempt to preclude one's opponent's impacts so common in the status quo. And, under the worldview comparison model, there is no need to spend time establishing and explaining a value and criterion, thereby easily making up any additional time needed to debate impacts under that model. Second, I think it's unwise to allow such a relatively minor practical concern to prevent such a significant improvement in the educational value of the activity, especially given our primary role as educators. (See how easy, and much more realistic, contextualized impact comparison is?)

truth testing bad cards

Truth Testing Leads To AFF strat skew

Mangus (Michael, "the value-comparison paradigm: a turn away from truth-testing,")

1. aff strategy skew. i am a huge fan of the spread, of tricky arguments, and of very fast debate. however, negative spreads have become horizontal rather than vertical. in other words, instead of making 40 answers to the affirmative case, negatives have taken to running multiple 'a priori' off-case positions. while i believe that off-case debate is good, aff's are in a rough place when it comes to answering these particular types of horizontal spread because each issue is a gateway argument – the affirmative must answer each position to win the debate, but they will be hard pressed to garner offense on them. in other words, if you prove language does in fact have meaning and causality does in fact exist and zeno's paradox is in fact resolvable, you will at best break even. the 1ar might be forced to spend 1.5-2 minutes answering back arguments that they have no chance of impact-turning – half of a speech dedicated to defense.

A2: Aprioris are the Same as theory

Aprioris are Different than Theory Because Offense Cannot Be Generated Off of them And they Are Imposed by the Resolution not the Debater

Mangus (Michael, "the value-comparison paradigm: a turn away from truth-testing,")

while many theory arguments are similarly gateway questions, there is a fundamental difference. when you, for example, run a case that is not topical, you have made a direct choice to engage a particular topic area and should be prepared to defend that that topic area is legitimate affirmative ground. however, you do not choose the resolution and all the accompanying assumptions thereof; it's a burden imposed on you by the topic, not by your own volition.
moreover, theory arguments have impacts that can be turned: education, fairness, etc. are all implications of debatable desirability. truth, on the other hand, is not an impact that you can prove good/bad – your only option is defense: deny the internal links (no, that is not true).

Truth Testing Leads to NEG Strat Skew

Mangus (Michael, "the value-comparison paradigm: a turn away from truth-testing,")

2. neg strategy skew. to compensate for these horizontal a priori spreads, affirmatives have increasingly relied on hidden a priori spikes in the 1ac. as a consequence, we have some very prominent debaters who win rounds by presenting a claim in the 1ac, a warrant in the 1ar, and an impact in the 2ar. arguments are insufficiently developed and negatives have little to no indication of what arguments in the aff are important. while critical thinking and strategic prediction are valuable skills, its unreasonable to expect a negative to read and answer every sentence of the 1ac. even when spikes can be isolated, answering them is problematic because they are often so vague that a complete response is impossible.

Truth Testing Leads to Irresolvable Debates

Mangus (Michael, "the value-comparison paradigm: a turn away from truth-testing,")

3. irresolvable debates. instead of reaching a sortof strategically-skewed synthesis, these two forces instead create debates that leave judges dumbfounded. the affirmative will drop an overview that "proves" the resolution contradictory while the negative will drop a spike that "proves" the resolution tautological. if the judge is lucky, one of these arguments will somehow respond to or undermine the other and a decision can be rendered with some degree of fairness. oftentimes, however, there is no comparison between the arguments and no obvious interaction between them. even in the first case, this is not the pinnacle of substantive debate. in the latter case, it is a direct invitation for judge intervention. this is not isolated to the lower brackets of tournaments either – many high-powered prelims and elimination rounds feature these strategies.

Truth Testing Leads to Defense Only Strategies

Mangus (Michael, "the value-comparison paradigm: a turn away from truth-testing,")

4. defense-only strategies. especially on the negative, debaters increasingly defend that their opponent is wrong, not that they are right. after all, the neg gets to defend ~p. even on the affirmative, many affirmatives tend to win debates with defensive arguments: ~p <=> p. under this framework, debaters are trained as sophists, not advocates. this also leads to debates that are difficult to adjudicate and, frankly, boring – if neither side is winning a clear impact to why their side is good (or true, under the dominant paradigm), its difficult to evaluate the winner of the round in a non-arbitrary way.

Policymaking good cards

Policy Easily Resolves Whether or Not Multiple Plans Can Be Justified

Lichtman and Rohrer (Allan J., Daniel M., “POLICY DISPUTE AND PARADIGM EVALUATION: A RESPONSE TO ROWLAND,” *Allan Lichtman is Professor of History at American University, and Daniel Rohrer is Associate Professor of Speech Communication and Theatre at Boston College.*)

First, Rowland contends that the policy-making model is unclear because it fails to indicate “whether the negative must defend a single policy system or may defend several systems.”⁹ Rowland’s quandary is readily resolved; policy comparison may involve any number of negative alternatives. As we noted in 1980, “A program of action is affirmed because it is superior to all other proposed competitors and rejected because it is not as desirable as at least one other competing proposal.”¹⁰

A2: Multiple Policy Options Overload Debate; However, This Is Not Applicable To Policy Making But Truth Testing. Policy Making Requires that Any Policy Advocated Is Warranted

Lichtman and Rohrer (Allan J., Daniel M., “POLICY DISPUTE AND PARADIGM EVALUATION: A RESPONSE TO ROWLAND,” *Allan Lichtman is Professor of History at American University, and Daniel Rohrer is Associate Professor of Speech Communication and Theatre at Boston College.*)

Rowland subsequently impugns the multiple policy option, arguing that it overloads the time capacity of debate by enticing negative teams to advance policy alternatives that cannot be adequately described or analyzed in a single debate.¹¹ This argument has force, however, for the hypothesis testing model, not for the policy systems paradigm. Unlike the hypothesis testers, we neither arbitrarily grant a favorable presumption to every negative alternative nor permit substantive contradictions among counterplans. We also require sufficient development of counterproposals for accurate policy comparison. In this context, the multiple policy option might actually serve to raise the standards of argumentation in academic debate. Negative advocates would be well advised to take the time necessary for presenting new policy systems only when their sustaining arguments are of high enough quality to offer compelling alternatives to affirmative cases.

A2: Policy Making Ignores Implementation Issues

Policy Making Framework Includes Implementation, This is Key to Effective Policy Making And AFF Bias Arguments Are Contradicted

Lichtman and Rohrer (Allan J., Daniel M., “POLICY DISPUTE AND PARADIGM EVALUATION: A RESPONSE TO ROWLAND,” *Allan Lichtman is Professor of History at American University, and Daniel Rohrer is Associate Professor of Speech Communication and Theatre at Boston College.*)

Second, Rowland maintains that the policy-making model “is biased for the affirmative” because it is easier to identify advantages than disadvantages of policy change.¹² Yet Rowland fails to show why this problem uniquely applies to our model of debate; whatever the prevailing theory, someone must propose a policy change and someone else must seek to oppose it. Moreover, Rowland later contradicts his argument by suggesting that the policy-making paradigm encourages catastrophic disadvantages of such magnitude as to defeat affirmative cases despite scant probability of their actual occurrence. Rowland further suggests that our model is biased toward the affirmative because it “downplays problems of implementation.”¹³ Yet we have pointed out that problems of implementation (with the exception of the illegitimate argument that the plan will not be adopted) are central to the policy-making model since they crucially affect the probability of achieving the affirmative advantages

A2: Policy Making Leads To a Skewed View of the Policy Environment

Policy Making In Debate Is an Accurate Reflection of Policy Making and Includes Soft Variables

Lichtman and Rohrer (Allan J., Daniel M., "POLICY DISPUTE AND PARADIGM EVALUATION: A RESPONSE TO ROWLAND," *Allan Lichtman is Professor of History at American University, and Daniel Rohrer is Associate Professor of Speech Communication and Theatre at Boston College.*)

Third, Rowland argues that the policy systems model "produces a skewed view of the policy environment" that deifies quantification, ignores "soft" variables, and submerges human values.¹⁵ Here **Rowland mows down an army of straw soldiers as he attacks an oversimplified view of policy-systems analysis. Although Pentagon planners and other officials have sought to devise a form of pseudo policy science that banishes questions of value and counts only that which is countable, our own approach emphasizes that policy systems analysis places matters of value at the forefront of analysis, incorporates soft variables, and avoids "the mechanical computation of exact numerical functions."** As we observed in a 1979 article devoted to the very issues raised in this objection, the **policy-systems model actually "paves the way for direct clashes over the ideology [a necessary component of any policy system] that implicitly or explicitly guides all human decision. For the model highlights the combination of fact and value in policy comparison and clarifies the relationships between means and ends in policy systems.** Rowland lampoons value debate, noting the absurdity of arbitrarily assigning "justice a numerical importance 7.3 with freedom slightly higher at 8.4" Such "a quantitative measure of value," he adds, "reflects only the rater's intuitive evaluation of the importance of the value."¹⁶ **Never do we advocate inflexible and arbitrary assignments of weights to core values like freedom and justice. Instead we alert advocates to the importance of grasping the philosophical foundations for guiding values and of establishing priorities among policy outcomes according to the value tradeoffs they entail.** It is Rowland, not us, who disparages the possibilities of debating human values. Rejecting Rowland's positivistic viewpoint that dismisses values dispute as inherently intuitive and thereby meaningless, we maintain **that debate over ideology is especially important for a society experiencing rapid technological change.** By drawing on humanity's rich historical tradition and examining alternative views on the nature of man, advocates may well be able to suggest non-arbitrary weightings of even highly abstract values. To abdicate this responsibility is to permit "our technology to define our values for us."¹⁷ Instead of ignoring soft variables that defy inclusion in a quantitative comparison of costs and benefits, **we explicitly incorporate them in the policy-making process.** Policy comparison, we have noted, "may not always accommodate the smooth exchange of benefits and costs."¹⁸ Certain fundamental rights of human beings, for instance, may be given absolute priority over other interests. Thus **policy debaters could legitimately contend that the examination of particular costs and benefits must take place within boundaries that cannot be crossed irrespective of circumstance.**¹⁹ Policy analysis also takes into account the process by which decisions are reached, encompassing Rowland's concern for "questions of responsibility."²⁰ Considerations relevant to the decision-making process as well as to the "end states" of policy simply become components of the costs and benefits to be weighed in the evaluation of competing policy.²¹

Use of the policy-systems paradigm does not mean that debate is reduced to the mechanical computation of numerical measures. The highest levels of rhetoric, analysis, and evidential support are required for warranting a choice among competing systems of policy:

advocates cannot simply accumulate quotations and contentions without explicitly showing how they relate to the task of policy comparison. We also warn against simplistic assumptions about the numerical exactitude that can be attained in policy dispute, observing that:

"Advocates seek estimates of probabilities and values that are as precise as possible, given limitations of information, time, and

⁹

A2: Policy Making Ignores Responsibility

Policy Making Includes the Analysis of end States and Does Not Advocate Simple Mechanical Computations, the Only Alternative to Policy Making is Ambiguity

Lichtman and Rohrer (Allan J., Daniel M., "POLICY DISPUTE AND PARADIGM EVALUATION: A RESPONSE TO ROWLAND," *Allan Lichtman is Professor of History at American University, and Daniel Rohrer is Associate Professor of Speech Communication and Theatre at Boston College.*)

Instead of ignoring soft variables that defy inclusion in a quantitative comparison of costs and benefits, we explicitly incorporate them in the policy-making process. Policy comparison, we have noted, "may not always accommodate the smooth exchange of benefits and costs."²⁰ Certain fundamental rights of human beings, for instance, may be given absolute priority over other interests. Thus policy debaters could legitimately contend that the examination of particular costs and benefits must take place within boundaries that cannot be crossed irrespective of circumstance.²¹ **Policy analysis also takes into account the process by which decisions are reached, encompassing Rowland's concern for "questions of responsibility."**²² Considerations relevant to the decision-making process as well as to the "end states" of policy simply become components of the costs and benefits to be weighed in the evaluation of competing policy.²³

Use of the policy-systems paradigm does not mean that debate is reduced to the mechanical computation of numerical measures. The highest levels of rhetoric, analysis, and evidential support are required for warranting a choice among competing systems of policy:

advocates cannot simply accumulate quotations and contentions without explicitly showing how they relate to the task of policy comparison. We also warn against simplistic assumptions about the numerical exactitude that can be attained in policy dispute, observing that:

"Advocates seek estimates of probabilities and values that are as precise as possible, given limitations of information, time, and

analytic technique. Even practitioners of the natural sciences often work comfortably with ranges of probability and estimates of variance²⁴ Rowland cites our stricture to be “as precise as possible” as though it were a sin;²⁵ but without such an effort, the only alternatives are ambiguity, imprecision, argument by anecdote and innuendo.

A2: High Magnitude Low Probability Impacts Bad

Evaluating High Impacts and Low Probability Impacts is a True Reflection of Policy Making

Lichtman and Rohrer (Allan J., Daniel M., “POLICY DISPUTE AND PARADIGM EVALUATION: A RESPONSE TO ROWLAND,” *Allan Lichtman is Professor of History at American University, and Daniel Rohrer is Associate Professor of Speech Communication and Theatre at Boston College.*)

Fourth, and finally, Rowland claims that the policy systems paradigm produces “bad argument” by encouraging debaters “to present catastrophic impact arguments” even when the chances of catastrophe occurring are minute. Debate, he observes, “would do well to copy other disciplines . . . and reject arguments which do not meet a minimum standard of proof,” adopting perhaps “the .05 significance level.”²⁶ Yet low probability, high-impact arguments are not necessarily “bad arguments.” Authorities in some fields such as epidemiology and nuclear power regulation realize the critical importance of including in their analyses assessments of even small probabilities of catastrophic events. Their work demonstrates the sophistication of the investigations required for establishing the likelihood of catastrophic occurrences.

Rowland also misrepresents the process of probabilistic reasoning in a comparison of policies context, thereby conjuring false dangers to debate. The import of a catastrophic outcome argument comes not from demonstrating at some level of probability that policy Y may produce catastrophic result X, but from showing that the probability of catastrophe X occurring is greater under policy Y than under alternative policy Y’ (which may, of course, be the present system). Even if it were true that one could readily show some small probability that catastrophic outcome X would result from adoption of policy Y, it decidedly does not follow that one could readily show that the probability of X given policy Y is greater than the probability of X given alternative policy Y’, i.e., that $P(X/Y) > P(X/Y')$. An advocate could argue, for example, that deployment of the MX missile system

risks nuclear war by destabilizing the current balance in strategic weaponry. But a defender of the MX could respond that failure to deploy the system risks nuclear war by giving the Soviets an opportunity to destroy America’s ground-based deterrent. The resolution of this controversy (i.e., the determination of whether $P(X/Y) > P(X/Y')$ or $P(X/Y) < P(X/Y')$ or $P(X/Y) = P(X/Y')$)

would involve highly complex argumentation and substantial presentation of evidence. Thus by insisting on the comparative nature of policy decisions, our debate paradigm protects advocates from cheaply made catastrophic impact arguments. Competing paradigms that slight the comparison of policy systems offer no such protection.

policymaking bad cards

High Magnitude, Low Probability impacts in policy making fails

Rowland ("THE PRIMACY OF STANDARDS FOR PARADIGM EVALUATION: A REJOINDER," Robert)

First, Lichtman and Rohrer misunderstand my objections to the policy making paradigm. For example, they all but ignore my explanation of how the pre. suppositions of the policy making perspective inevitably lead policy makers to downplay or even ignore non-quantifiable issues. Even more seriously, they misrepresent several of my arguments. For example, Lichtman and Rohrer claim that by objecting to big impact disadvantages I both ignore the potential value of such disadvantages and contradict my other claim that policy making is biased for the affirmative.⁶ Actually, the point is that because policy making lacks minimum standards for evaluating arguments, both affirmative and negative debaters are encouraged to present enormous impact arguments in situations where they do not apply.⁷ On a related issue, Lichtman and Rohrer accuse me of inconsistently objecting to the emphasis in policy making on quantification, while at the same time suggesting use of the .05 significance standard as a numerically precise measure of the minimum proof level which all arguments should meet before being considered.⁸ Lichtman and Rohrer then express surprise that I would defend such an obviously inconsistent position. Actually, I never defended the position which they describe. Instead, I referred to the .05 significance test and minimum proof standards used in science and the humanities in order to dispute the position of policy makers that all arguments should be evaluated probabilistically regardless of the supporting evidence.⁹ It is very clear in the context of the essay that I would never advocate the use of a numerically precise minimum burden of proof standard. It is also hardly fair of Lichtman and Rohrer to claim that I "dismiss values dispute as inherently intuitive and thereby meaningless."¹⁰ My point is that the attempt by policy makers to quantify the importance of all problems often fails and may lead to a misstatement of the importance of a problem. Lichtman and Rohrer ignore or misrepresent many of the substantive objections to the policy making model.

Policy Paradigm Leads to an Oversimplification of Real World Policy making, this de-links them from their offense

Rowland ("THE PRIMACY OF STANDARDS FOR PARADIGM EVALUATION: A REJOINDER," Robert)

A second problem with the defense of policy making by Lichtman and Rohrer is that rather than defeating objections to the model, they tend to simply define those objections as irrelevant. For example, they claim that the real world experience with cost benefit analysis, PPBS, and other forms of policy making is not relevant to an evaluation of the policy making debate paradigm.¹¹ This position is most unsatisfactory. It is not at all clear why the experience with real world forms of policy making, which are built on the same assumptions as the policy making debate paradigm, is not relevant to analysis of that debate paradigm. It is very easy for Lichtman and Rohrer to characterize real

world policy analysis as an “oversimplification.”¹² However, since they do not identify the fundamental philosophical differences between this “oversimplification” analysis and their own system, there is every reason to believe that the problems which plague real world policy making might also plague the policy making debate model. Real world policy makers do not purposely ignore questions of value or problems of implementation. Those policy scientists do their best to take into account all of the relevant issues, but the assumptions of their paradigm lead them into error. The same could well be true of the policy making debate paradigm.

Policy Making Framework Is Vague and Inconsistent

Rowland (“THE PRIMACY OF STANDARDS FOR PARADIGM EVALUATION: A REJOINDER,” Robert)

The final objection to Lichtman’s and Rohrer’s position is that policy making paradigm, which they defend, has become so vague as to be all things to all people. Lichtman and Rohrer now allow the negative to defend multiple policy positions as long as those positions are adequately defined and consistent.¹³ However, they do not explain why the negative may not defend inconsistent policies as long as those positions are independent policy systems. The op. ponents of the AWACS sale argued both that Saudi Arabia is so strong that the planes are not needed and so weak that the planes would do no good. The requirement that the policy positions be adequately defined is also essentially meaningless. Few judges will vote for positions which they believe are inadequately defined. The policy making paradigm is becoming increasingly vague in other areas as well. Lichtman and Rohrer now argue that the policy maker should not require debaters to quantify all harms, and should in some instances give special attention to qualitative or value related harms.¹⁴ In addition, they add ambiguity to the model by admitting that ‘Certain fundamental rights of human beings, for instance, may be

given absolute priority over other interests’~ In the original model, no interest was ever given absolute priority over other interests.¹⁵ Rather, all of the various competing interests were compared. Finally, Lichtman and Rohrer now agree that all questions of theory and substance may be disputed in a given debate.~~

Policy Making is a Framework That cannot be Used in Round

Rowland (“THE PRIMACY OF STANDARDS FOR PARADIGM EVALUATION: A REJOINDER,” Robert)

At this point, I question whether the version of policy making described by Lichtman and Rohrer is any longer a useable paradigm. It should be recalled that paradigms provide both the lens through which the debate world is viewed and the standards by which arguments are evaluated. Policy making as described by Lichtman and Rohrer, no longer fulfills either function. A policy making judge may or may not limit the negative to a single policy. The judge may attempt to weigh all issues in quantitative terms, or may give precedence to questions of value, or may even give absolute priority to some issue and ignore the other issues. A policy maker might give absolute priority to an argument about motive or presumption, which was tied to some “fundamental right.” At that point, the policy making judge might be defining the issue of motive or presumption in terms which are normally associated with the hypothesis testing or stock issues paradigm. The policy making model which emerges from Lichtman’s and Rohrer’s essay is now so vague that either stock issues analysis or hypothesis testing could fit comfortably within it. Zarefsky’s main argument against the functional view of paradigm evaluation flows from his analysis of debate as a sub-set of argumentation

which serves as a model for all of argument.¹⁸ As I understand his position, Zarefsky believes that debate is a field of argumentation which is valuable because it fulfills the general goals served by all argumentation and because it serves as a paradigm case or model for argument. Zarefsky reasons that since there are no clearly agreed upon purposes of argumentation, it is fruitless to try and establish standards for evaluating all debate paradigms. A paradigm which fulfilled one purpose might not fulfill another purpose. In addition, Zarefsky argues that since debate serves as a model for argument, theoretical questions should take precedence over practical matters in the evaluation of paradigms.

The Point of Debate is Not to Create Effective Policy But To Develop Skills To Come to the Truth as Close as Possible

Rowland ("THE PRIMACY OF STANDARDS FOR PARADIGM EVALUATION: A REJOINDER," Robert)

I think that Zarefsky's position is fundamentally flawed because it incorrectly identifies the purpose of debate. Debate does not primarily serve as a model for argument. Nor does it serve the same purposes which argument serves in society. If the goal of debate were to act as a model for argument, then the competitive aspects of debate would be largely unnecessary. The argumentation scholar could build a model of argument and then study a few debates to test the model. There would be no need for the continuing process of tournament competition. I do not deny that the study of debate may help elucidate some portions of argumentation theory, but the resulting theoretical advances are side benefits and not the primary purpose of debate. It is also clear that debate does not serve the same purposes as real world argumentation. In the real world, policy makers could not tolerate a system, which allowed inferior policies to be selected, because they were supported by superior advocates. Yet, there are many debates in A REJOINDER.¹⁸ Zarefsky, "The Perils of Assessing Paradigms," p. 141. 158 which superior teams win because of their skill, and despite defense of inferior policy positions. Academic debate, as I argued in the original essay on paradigm evaluation, is a poor method of making policy or evaluating scientific hypotheses, but it is a good method of teaching students how to build arguments so that they can make policy or evaluate hypotheses. Here, Zarefsky misunderstands the statement that, "The ultimate goal of debate is to teach people how to argue effectively."¹⁹ Zarefsky proposes several definitions of "effectively" and eventually concludes that the concept is unreasonably vague.²⁰ By claiming that debate teaches people how to argue effectively, I meant that debate teaches people how to build good arguments in order to come as close to the truth as possible. It is not necessary to define "good argument," because the debate process is built on the assumption that the dialectical interchange between advocates is the best test of argument quality. The dialectical process forces debaters to argue "realistically," "creatively," "analytically," and so on in order to defeat the arguments of the opposition. Debate, is primarily an educational activity which teaches debaters to build good arguments. Once it is understood that the purpose of debate is to teach argumentation skills, most of Zarefsky's objections to the five proposed evaluative standards quickly disappear. First, I think that Zarefsky is mistaken when he suggests that all of the major paradigms are clear and internally consistent. I have argued at some length elsewhere that the policy making paradigm is neither clear nor ¹⁹ See Robert Rowland, "Standart for Paradigm Evaluation," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, p. 139. ²⁰ Zarefsky, "The Perils of Assessing Paradigms," p. 142. consistent,²¹ Lichtman's and Rohrer's latest defense of policy making, in their critique of "Standards for Paradigm Evaluation," illustrates this problem.

***Chapter 10: Miscellaneous

Citing Without Permission bad

- A. **Interpretation:** Debater's must provide written permission from the author in order to cite articles that indicate permission is necessary for quotation.
- B. **Violation:** My opponent cites a card from one such article without written permission.
- C. **Standards:**
 - 1. **Source validity** - authors continually change and update their positions when drafting articles, which means that the author may not ultimately agree with the conclusions drawn from cited evidence. In working papers, conclusions are often pre-drafted before all experimental analysis is complete, which means that we have no idea whether the ideas proposed in the paper are the result of rigorous experimentation or research. They can claim that this evidence has the same ethos appeal as that from other authors, but we have no way of verifying that. Source validity is key to fairness because we do not have limitless resources in-round and cannot fact-check every statement, so we have to rely on the fact that work by topic authors possesses a certain degree of academic quality and base our arguments off that assumption. Source validity is also key to education because we gain no benefits from debating sources that are not even academically sound.
 - 2. **Access to research** – they ignored the author's message and used the evidence anyway, but other debaters may have been more academically ethical and asked permission. We have no way of knowing whether the author would have granted those debaters permission, so by using the position without receiving the same constraints, they give themselves access to research that no one else has. If everyone asks permission before citing such articles, this grants everyone equal access to those same articles. Equal access to research is key to fairness because research determines our abilities to make arguments that could win us the round, so if one person has access to more research then they unfairly have a better opportunity to win.
 - 3. **Inconsistency:** Often within drafts, Authors continually change and update their position. This means that the author may not agree with the conclusions drawn from my opponent's evidence. In working papers, authors have not thought out the thesis or conclusion of the paper which means it would allow for multiple conclusions to be drawn from an article. This is key to fairness because citing inconstant and unfinished justifies strawmaning arguments and deleting text from articles, this allows debaters to be manipulative and destroys the competitive nature of debate.
 - 4. **Academic Honesty- Citing Without permission violates academic honesty**
An Author's Permission Must Always Be Given

KIEEME 09 ("STATEMENT OF ETHICS AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE PUBLICATION OF RESEARCH,"

Enacted in March 2000, mostly revised in December 2009

KIEEME, Rm 807, The Korea Science & Technology Center, 635-4, Yeoksam-dong, Gangnam-gu, Seoul 135-703, Korea,

Tel: +82-2-538-7958, Fax: +82-2-538-3623, **Trans. Electr. Electron. Mater.**

<http://transeem.org/data/STATEMENT%20OF%20ETHICS%20AND%20RESPONSIBILITIES%20IN%20THE%20PUBLICATION%20OF%20RESEARCH.pdf>

The authors' central obligation is to present a concise, accurate account of the research performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance. A paper should contain sufficient detail and references to public sources of information to permit others to repeat the work. Proper acknowledgment of the work of others used in a research project **must always be given**. Authors should cite publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work. Information obtained privately, as in conversation, correspondence, or discussion with third parties, should not be used or reported without explicit permission from the investigator with whom the information originated. **Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, cannot be used without permission of the author of the work being used. Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the concept, design, execution, or interpretation of the research study.** All those who have made significant contributions should be offered the opportunity to be listed as authors. Other individuals who have contributed to the study should be acknowledged, but not identified as authors. The sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed. **Plagiarism constitutes unethical scientific behavior and is never acceptable.** It is unethical for an author to publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal of primary publication. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently is unethical and unacceptable. If related manuscripts are being submitted concurrently, the author should inform the editor of the relationship between the manuscripts. When an error is discovered in a published work, it is the obligation of all authors to promptly retract the paper or correct the results. An erratum for publication should be submitted when a significant error is discovered in one of her or his published reports.

It is unfair to violate the author's control of their intellectual property. This is the equivalent to stealing because you are disregarding the author's right to their thoughts and taking them as your own. Contradicting the will of the author violates one of the fundamental rules of academia. Schools fail, expel, disassociate with students who have committed academic fraud, this ought to be the same in the debate. This is the strongest link into fairness because lying and cheating destroys the competitive equity of debate and the integrity of our competition. If I choose to respect the authors request I am punished because I don't have access to these cards.

D. Voters

Miscut evidence bad

A. Interpretation: The opponent must cut card evidence that is completely relevant to the author's views in the article sourcing the information

B. Violation: The opponent did not cut evidence from the articles in a way that referenced the views of the article.

C. Standards:

1. Predictability: By mis-cutting cards, the opponent removes an element of predictability in evidence that he presents because I may have ran into the same article while researching the topic for my case. Because debaters often find themselves running into the same articles, there is quite often an element of predictability that each debater has if they happen to hear cut evidence from an article they skimmed while researching or possibly used on another case. Researching these articles and becoming familiar with the topic literature allows debaters to better prepare arguments or find other credible cards that combat this information. However, if the information has been mis-cut, the element of predictability disappears. Furthermore, the opponent is forced to scramble for a last minute credible warrant to refute evidence that is not credible. This misuse of evidence links to fairness because each debater should be given an equal opportunity to win the round if they used the same resources to warrant their claims, and by adjusting the opinions of the author, my opponent has a clear advantage over me.

2. Misuse of Topic Literature: My opponent was able to not only phrase the words of the author to his advantage, but he also used the credible name of the author to make his evidence appear more credible. Theoretically, if we allow any debater to cut cards in such a way that they can skew the author's initial thoughts and beliefs in the article, then every debater could pick words and phrases that advocated their own beliefs and simply reference it back to a credible source. The whole reason that the original source was credible was because there was a credible author or expert on the subject of the resolution that decided to explain his/her views. Mis-cutting cards simply makes the evidence as credible as the person who cut the evidence. We can deduce that my opponent's evidence is no more credible and should have no weight in the round. In fact, placing a credible author's name on evidence that clearly outlines the beliefs of my opponent is extremely unfair because it gives credibility to information that deserves none.

Full cites necessary

- A. **Interpretation:** Debaters must have available full citations for all evidence read in round.
- B. **Violation:** S/he admits that s/he does not have full citations available
- C. **Standards:**
 - 1. **Evidence ethics:** Requiring debaters to have their citations accessible is necessary to prevent evidence distortion. Without open access to tags and cites, there isn't a way for the debate community to hold debaters accountable for mis-cut evidence. Without accountability, there is NO incentive to not distort evidence. Misrepresented evidence destroys the educational value of debate because academically dishonest debaters are rewarded by claiming ethos for arguments that do not actually stem from reputable sources while those who maintain academic integrity are severely disadvantaged. Furthermore, misrepresenting evidence egregiously distorts the academic work of an author and promotes further evidence distortion in future contexts. The judge has a duty to promote honest academic practice and thus must prevent activity that is detrimental to the academic world.
 - 2. **Effective clash:** Requiring debaters to have their citations available allows other debaters interested in the evidence presented in the round to research good responses and subsequently effectively engage in similar or identical positions. Failing to have such citations available renders debaters unable to evaluate the evidence outside of round more carefully. Thus lack of evidence citations prevents future debates from containing substantial clash of solid evidence. Clash is key to education because it allows debaters to develop critical thinking skills when comparing evidence. **Furthermore**, the lack of accountability that incentivizes evidence makes it impossible to effectively engage such warrants because there is *no* amount of research that could enable one to predict the distorted evidence since it is not derived from the actual topic literature. If s/he tells you that there are disclosure forums where debaters could get these cites, this is no excuse for his/her failure to provide them in this round because this is the only way to unequivocally match evidence to the arguments espoused in this round.
- D.

Ellipses bad

A is Interpretation: Debaters must have the full text of all their evidence available.

B is Violation: His/Her evidence has ellipses.

C is Standards:

1) Research Burdens – My opponent can use ellipses to make their evidence say virtually anything. For example, removing the word “not” would reverse the author’s argument. Since I can’t read the full text of the card to determine if they are grossly misrepresenting the evidence, s/he is incentivized to change it and therefore make it unresearchable. This gives me an impossible research burden as what I can research is constrained by what topical authors write about. My interp solves because all evidence would be constrained to the topical literature. Reciprocal Research Burdens is key to fairness as unresearched arguments will be qualitatively worse than researched ones. My opponent’s arguments will necessarily be better than my answers so s/he will have an easier time accessing the ballot.

2) Academic Honesty – Ellipses are academically dishonest because they can alter the author’s advocacy. The evidence is therefore disingenuous to the intent of the author who wrote it.

Academic Honesty is key to education because in the real world there are massive repercussions for academic dishonesty in schools and other educational forums. Real world learning is key to education as debate is only valuable if it teaches us how to make decisions in the real world.

Switch-sides debate good

A. Interpretation – the aff must be topical and the neg must directly contest the affirmative advocacy.

B. Violation –

C. Standards –

1. **Effective clash** – Their strategy allows them to avoid clash on the fundamental part of the debate, and just concede most of my case instead of engaging in it. This destroys clash because there are few points of contention in the round; they agree with my advocacy, but say that theirs should win the ballot for a reason unrelated to debating the resolution. Clash is key to education as the actual debating and comparison of arguments is what gives us the skills to make decisions and well-reasoned arguments in the real world. Also, without the expectation of confrontation of arguments, there is no such thing as a likely strategy or argument and all predictability ceases. Predictability is key to fairness because one, our inability to predict arguments out-of-round skews our research and preparation so that we are always behind on the evidence debate, and two, our ability to predict strategies in-round directs our ability to formulate responses and generate strategy which is how we win the round.

2. **Reciprocal research burdens** – when they do not engage in switch-side debate, they only need to do research for one side of the resolution while I have done research for both sides. This also destroys breadth of research because we only research one side instead of both sides of the issue in academia, literally cutting our education knowledge in half. Switch-side debate promotes fair research burdens because people must research both aff and neg arguments and responses to those arguments. Reciprocal research burdens are key to fairness because the research that we do determines our ability to generate arguments that could win us the round, but we only have a limited amount of time in which to do research. When they can artificially lower their research burden, this allows them to do great depth of research on one topic and preclude all of my responses, placing me at an unfair disadvantage.

3. **Critical thinking** – when they do not engage in switch-side debate, they avoid the lessons in critical thinking skills that debate can teach. The ability to construct well-reasoned arguments for positions that we may not necessarily agree with uniquely teaches critical thinking because it expands our understanding of argumentation. We learn more about logic and argumentation when formulating advocacies that we do not agree with, because we are better able to see the flaws in logic as they occur and seek to correct them. Switch-side debate ensures that debaters participate in this educational experience , because everyone must find one side of each resolution more believable than the other. Critical thinking skills are a valuable educational tool. Harrigan explains

CASEY Harrigan, A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF ARTS, 2008, “A DEFENSE OF SWITCH SIDE DEBATE”.

Defined as “reasonable reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do” (Ennis, 1987, p. 10), **critical thinking learned through debate teaches students not just how advocate and argue, but how to decide as well.** Each and **every student**, whether in debate or (more likely) **at some later point in life, will be placed in the position of the decision-maker. Faced with competing options whose costs and benefits are initially unclear, critical thinking is necessary to assess all the possible outcomes of each choice, compare their relative merits, and arrive at some final decision** about which is preferable. In some instances, such as choosing whether to eat

Chinese or Indian food for dinner, the importance of making the correct decision is minor. For many other decisions, however, the implications of choosing an imprudent course of action are potentially grave. As Robert Crawford notes, there are “issues of unsurpassed importance in the daily lives of millions upon millions of people...being decided to a considerable extent by the power of public speaking” (2003). Although the days of the Cold War are over, and the risk that “the next Pearl Harbor could be ‘compounded by hydrogen’” (Ehninger and Brockriede, 1978, p. 3) is greatly reduced, the manipulation of public support before the invasion of Iraq in 2003 points to the continuing necessity of training a well-informed and critically-aware public (Zarefsky, 2007). In the absence of debate-trained critical thinking, ignorant but ambitious politicians and persuasive but nefarious leaders would be much more likely to draw the country, and possibly the world, into conflicts with incalculable losses in terms of human well-being. Given the myriad threats of global proportions that will require incisive solutions, including global warming, the spread of pandemic diseases, and the proliferation of [WMDs] weapons of mass destruction, cultivating a robust and effective society of critical decision-makers is essential. As Louis Rene Beres writes, “with such learning, we Americans could prepare...not as immobilized objects of false contentment, but as authentic citizens of an endangered planet” (2003). Thus, it is not surprising that critical thinking has been called “the highest educational goal of the activity” (Parcher, 1998).

Since the most valuable thing debate can do is prepare its participants for the future, critical thinking is a necessary educational component of the activity.

Narratives bad

A: interpretation - debaters must only use evidence that is objective or analytical

B: violation - my opponent is running narrative evidence and is requiring voting on narratives

C: standards -

1. predictability – there are an infinite number of stories or narratives under every topic, since stories cover every aspect or experience of an issue and can be expressed by any actor associated with a situation. Assuming that narratives are legitimate argumentation, I can't have any kind of pre-round predictability about which narrative my opponent will choose since it's impossible for me to research all narrative possibilities. Predictability is key to fairness because the person running the unpredictable argument is prepared, whereas I can't generate a counternarrative or another strategy because I don't have any idea what their narrative *might* be.

2. effective clash - by saying that they should win based on an arbitrary factor [such as representation], they reduce effective clash. There is no way I can make arguments against the actual position without first engaging in an un-educational debate about whose arbitrary reason to win the round is better, which is ineffective because there is no way to prioritize who deserves more [representation]. Constraining us to debating empirical or analytical warrants eliminates this kind of debate because both types of warrants are easily comparable. Effective clash is key to fairness because arbitrary argumentation favors the side who anticipated the arbitrary clash, since they can prepare marginally better arguments in advance for why their arbitrarily chosen position is better. Effective clash is also key to education since it promotes argumentation and strategy that cannot occur in a world absence clash, both of which are valuable skills that debate can teach.

D.

SEE DEPENDING ON THE POSITION: switch-sides debate good, aff must be topical, non-implementable kritik alternatives bad, mindset fiat bad and paradigm issues.

Negatively worded interpretations bad

Interpretation – The AFF and the NEG must use positively worded interpretations

Violation – the aff/neg uses a negatively worded interpretations

Standards 1 .Reciprocity – the negative interpretation does not say what their kind of debate would look like, just the one thing it doesn't include. This means

A. they can never generate offense on theory, since the way you gain offense is by comparing two rules for debate, and the relative desirability of each. If someone runs a “truth testing” bad interpretation, then you wouldn't know how to evaluate it unless they proposed a different paradigm - without an explicit alternative there's no way to tell what's good or bad.

B. My ability to respond to theory is devastated – I can't weigh between the violations and relative unfairness when there's no way for me to tell what their form of debate looks like. Moreover, without a positive interpretation I can't get external disadvantages to their interpretations to weigh against mine – they avoid having to actually establish a rule for debate I can respond to. This destroys reciprocity on the theory flow since it's always easier to criticize than to advocate – of course they'll win on theory if I can't show why their interpretation is a bad idea.

- S/He'll say I can just impact turn their violation I.E. why showing why this one forbidden thing is valuable, but only impact turns is still wildly unreciprocal theory ground– I can't run counter standards, or other reason why their interpretation is a bad idea, while they can go full out on my interpretation.

2. predictability in theory- you could run a negatively phrased interpretation on seriously any word in the AC – I can't be expected to think deeply about every possible element of anything I'm doing, all I can do is attempt to follow rules that I think produce good debate. Predictable in terms of fairness is key since if he can find arbitrary reasons why something I'm doing is slightly unfair, and then just criticize without showing an actual rule which I can follow, I have no ability to be prepared for theory and be able to defend the legitimacy of my arguments. The only way I can construct a fair AC is by thinking about rules I can follow, not through evaluating each fragment.

D is the impact - Fairness.

(_) First, If a round is unfair, that means the outcome no longer relates to the in game skill of the participants. Thus you can't know who has done the better debating, just the more abusive. The ballot asks you who has done the better debating, and fairness structurally allows you to see whose better at debate.

(_) Second, Prefer competing interpretations to reasonability as it's strategic to be abusive, meaning debaters have an incentive to be as close to the line of reasonability as possible, thus debates under reasonability will always be worse than they could be under competing interps.

(_) Third, Drop the debater as time spent on theory can't be made up- I was forced to run theory and further the abuse the argument caused in round also hurt my ability to win even after it goes away. The implication is that you need to vote off theory as the round is irrevocably altered away from the substance.

(_) Fourth - this invalids that other shell by showing you that you can't fairly evaluate the theory flow and thus can't fairly determine if there was abuse in that case.

FOR CX: - empirically proven, the “condo counterplans bad” shell would be unresponsible too if I couldn't establish why conditional counterplans are bad as compared to dispositional or unconditional counterplans.

Arbitrary counter-interp planks bad

Interpretation: Debaters must have a link to a standard for every part of their counter interpretation.

Violation: My opponent's counter interpretation includes the arbitrary component "_____ which they do not link specifically to any standards in the counter interpretation

Standards:

1: Link turn ground. Because there are arbitrary components of the counter interpretation, I cannot generate offense on those components because they are not explicitly linked to any standard, making it more difficult for me to win the theory debate because all of the components of my interpretation are specifically linked to a standard so my opponent is granted link turn ground that I am denied.

2: Arbitrary Distinctions: Allowing arbitrary counter interpretations causes arbitrary distinctions to be drawn in theoretical issues for what is permissible and impermissible, allowing debaters to justify solely what they do without defending the fairness of the macro-theoretical issues.

Affirmative teams occasionally respond similarly to topicality arguments by offering the counter-interpretation that only their plan is topical, and negative teams have figured out by now that these kinds of counter-interpretations are highly arbitrary. We contend that just like an interpretation of what is topical ought to be grounded in some non-arbitrary literature, interpretations of what the negative ought to be allowed to fiat also should be non-arbitrary. The current repertoire of interpretations that debaters use mainly focuses on distinctions like public vs. private actors, domestic vs. international decision-makers, multi-actor fiat and object fiat, but these categories miss the mark completely, because they have nothing to do with the foundation of negative fiat, the logic of decision-making. When alternative agent fiat is allowed, there really is no non-arbitrary method of preventing object fiat. Since every harm area is a consequence of no one's solving it, every alternative agent counter plan is at least a little bit object fiat. While some counterplans are clearly "'more unfair" than others, if we can agree with the general principle that object fiat harms competitive equity, the only true solution is to prevent all alternative agent fiat.

This skews fairness because it allows debaters to create the illusion that their specific practice is fair whereas it is really a component of or justifies a larger, highly unfair practice, and education because debaters do not defend the true assumptions of their arguments, destroying clash.

3: Argument quality. Arbitrary counter interpretations lead to poor argumentation because first: they allow for debaters to construct arguments with incomplete link stories by allowing them to omit a link between the standard and part of the interpretation and second: Because parts of the counter interpretation are not linked to standards then it makes responses to the counter interpretation blippy and underdeveloped because there was no link in the first place to be contested on a substantive level, which destroys education because we do not learn anything from engaging in blippy and unwarranted debate because this does not allow us to learn how to properly construct and defend an argument, one of the most valuable skills we learn in debate.

File Name

res

172

Stuyvesant AE

Page 170 /

Non-shell theory bad

A- Interpretation: Theory must be run in the form of a shell with an explicit interpretation, violation, standards, links between the violation and the standards, internal links between the standards and fairness, and an impact with a decision rule.

B- Violation: theirs isn't (specify why)

C- Standards:

1. **Stable advocacy-** The interpretation and violation of a theory shell indicate exactly what we should be doing and how the other side has violated that. Without an explicit interpretation and violation they can shift their advocacy depending on my answers. This is an internal link to fairness because if they can switch how I link in to the position or what their advocacy is I don't have a fair chance at beating it.
2. **Argument clarity-** The shell format helps your opponent to internally signpost the arguments and understand what is being done and why it is bad for debate. Refusing to use the standard format is uniquely harmful in the case of theory because I need to be able to understand exactly what I'm doing and why you're asking the judge to vote me down on it in order to be able to answer the theory argument, which is key to fairness because otherwise they can gain offense on theory due to the fact that I simply could not answer their arguments
3. **Argument quality-** Without a theory shell debaters can have missing internal links in their appeals to fairness or education as there is no accountability for level of argument development such as the shell structure, which is unfair because my arguments are held to higher standards of acceptability based on the requirements of various structural components such as having uniqueness, a link, and an impact for an advantage or disadvantage.

ⁱ The author would like to thank Carly Woods, Clint Woods, and J.P. Lacy for their helpful suggestions on this paper.

ⁱⁱ The author would like to thank Carly Woods, Clint Woods, and J.P. Lacy for their helpful suggestions on this paper.

ⁱⁱⁱ The author would like to thank Carly Woods, Clint Woods, and J.P. Lacy for their helpful suggestions on this paper.

^{iv} The author would like to thank Carly Woods, Clint Woods, and J.P. Lacy for their helpful suggestions on this paper.

^v Such splintering has happened in each of the past three decades. It began when in the 1970s when the Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA) was formed as a break away group from the NDT. It continued in the 1980s with the creation of the American Debate Association (ADA), a rules based organization that kept the NDT topic, but crafted a series of content rules to govern the conduct of debates. And it occurred again in the 1990s with the formation of the National Educational Debate Association (NEDA) which was itself a reaction to the trend toward NDT style debating in CEDA. However, splits in the larger debate community, are not always permanent as the reunion of NDT and CEDA in the mid-1990s demonstrates.

^{vi} The author would like to thank Carly Woods, Clint Woods, and J.P. Lacy for their helpful suggestions on this paper.

^{vii} The author would like to thank Carly Woods, Clint Woods, and J.P. Lacy for their helpful suggestions on this paper.

^{viii} The author would like to thank Carly Woods, Clint Woods, and J.P. Lacy for their helpful suggestions on this paper.

^{ix} The author would like to thank Carly Woods, Clint Woods, and J.P. Lacy for their helpful suggestions on this paper.

^x The author would like to thank Carly Woods, Clint Woods, and J.P. Lacy for their helpful suggestions on this paper.