# March April T File

## Solvency advocate

#### A. Interpretation: If the aff advocates for a subset of the resolution, then they must have a carded solvency advocates that advocates for the aff and explicitly calls it a “right to housing” read in the 1AC.

#### B. Violation:

#### C. Prefer my interp:

#### 1. Limits. Using the term of art is key to ensuring that the neg can actually engage in the aff. Infinite things that can be considered a “right to housing”, i.e. the US passes a policy to stop climate change and prevent the sea from rising thus protecting the right to housing for people on coastal cities. Under their interp, literally anything that is tangentially related to housing becomes topical which explodes aff ground killing neg engagement since I can’t even research their advocacy. Outweighs under competing interps since infinite affs makes it impossible to set a norm for debate.

#### 2. Topic Focus- my interp is key to ensuring topical affs. Their paradigm for debate is unable to draw a line for what constitutes “topical” absent allowing near infinite affs. Means that only my interp ensures that that the aff is topical and in the topic lit. This is a constraint on the judges ability to adjudicate the round since the judge as obligation to affirm the resolution and absent T they aren’t affirming the resolution but affirming something else.

## Shelters aren’t topical

#### Interpretation: The affirmative cannot fiat an increase in shelters for homeless groups- they must defend allowing people to have housing.

#### Housing implies houses and apartments considered collectively- that’s google dictionary.

https://www.google.com/webhp?sourceid=chrome-instant&rlz=1C5CHFA\_enUS730US731&ion=1&espv=2&ie=UTF-8#q=housing+definition&\*

#### Violation: That’s the aff- trans shelters.

#### Vote Neg:

#### Legal Context- The right to housing and right to shelter are different in legal doctrine that currently establishes rights.

**Hartman 98** Chester (urban planner, author, and academic. He is Director of Research of the Poverty & Race Research Action Council in Washington, D.C.). The Case for a Right rto Housing. http://nhi.org/online/issues/148/righttohousing.html]

Tenants **in** public and **Section 8** housing are required to pay no more than 30 percent of their income as rent. In a few areas, **by statute or litigation**, **homeless persons have a right to shelter (not to be confused with housing**), and for the homeless there also exists, again in just a few areas, what might be labeled "a right not to freeze to death": ordinances requiring that public buildings be opened to homeless persons when the temperature dips below a certain level.

#### That outweighs- this is a legal topic since the RTH is a question of specific legislation being past meaning that we should be most consistent with what legal norms have established. Also legal context proves overwhelming consensus of the topic lit flows aff since shelters are established as part of statute, where housing isn’t.

#### Topic Focus

#### Two warrants-

#### Legality- that’s the evidence from the first standard- we’ve already established a right to shelters in section 8 meaning that it’s not a relevant question to the topic.

#### The nexus question of the right to housing debate is about establishing the concept of permanent lodging as inalienable, which draws in totally different bodies of literature from something like shelter, which is about temporary living.

#### Lit shows- the right to housing is an expansion of the right to shelter- the 1AC is functionally the squo in terms of political goals.

**Hartman 98** Chester (urban planner, author, and academic. He is Director of Research of the Poverty & Race Research Action Council in Washington, D.C.). The Case for a Right rto Housing. http://nhi.org/online/issues/148/righttohousing.html]

What would be the first step in creating a Right to Housing?  
**Were we to accept, politically**, the need to establish **a Right to Housing**, we then would have to fill in the details as to the content of that right. While we're not at that point, and all our energies should focus on achieving the principle and acceptance that there should be a Right to Housing, it is useful at least to list **what elements need to be considered.**

o ***Affordability standards*.** Rather than the usual percentage-of-income rule, Michael Stone, the late Cushing Dolbeare and others have put forward an approach that should be the operating principle - **ensuring that all non-shelter needs,** in addition to housing costs, **can be met**, thus producing a percentage figure that is not a fixed number but a variable according to household size and income level.

o ***Physical condition and space standards*. The best local housing code standards** (following a detailed examination of these ordinances) **might be posited, or possibly HUD's Housing Quality Standards.** Overcrowding standards must guard, on the one hand, against cultural bias and, on the other hand, against accepting dramatically lower standards for the poor.

o ***A suitable living environment*. With regard to the super-important issue of neighborhood quality,** there are few, if any, usable standards at present, and so serious work must be undertaken to develop these. And security of tenure should be a key element, too, while allowing for reasonable land-use changes

#### Impacts- kills limits and ground- you can defend anything within the context of making life easier like justifies infinite tiny affs that give livability- co-ops, shelters, even would juzstofy absurd things like giving people beds to sleep. We lose core neg args- like dependency turns, the market DA, or the crime DA- since shelters aren’t about the same type of permanent areas to live.

#### T version- defend housing assistance for trans youth such as giving them homes. Solves all your discussion offense.

## Positive right

#### Interpretation: The right to housing is a positive right.

Velasquez et al 14 -- Manuel Velasquez, Claire Andre, Thomas Shanks, S.J., and Michael J. Meyer. “Rights”. MARKKULA CENTER FOR APPLIED ETHICS, Aug. 8, 2014. https://www.scu.edu/ethics/ethics-resources/ethical-decision-making/rights/

Kant's principle is also often used to justify positive or, as they are often called, welfare rights. Where **negative rights are "negative" in the sense that they claim for each person a zone of non-interference** from others, **positive rights are "positive" in the sense that they claim for each person the positive assistance** of others in fulfilling basic constituents of human well-being like health and education. In moral and political philosophy, **these** basic human needs **are often referred to as "welfare" concerns** (thus this use of the term "welfare" is similar to but not identical with the common American usage of "welfare" to refer to government payments to the poor). Many people argue that a fundamental right to freedom is worthless if people aren't able to exercise that freedom. A right to freedom, then, implies that every human being also has a fundamental right to what is necessary to secure a minimum level of well being. **Positive rights**, therefore, **are rights that provide something that people need to secure their well being, such as** a right to an education, the right to food, the right to medical care, **the right to housing**, or the right to a job. Positive rights impose a positive duty on us—the duty actively to help a person to have or to do something. A young person's right to an education, for example, imposes on us a duty to provide that young person with an education. Respecting a positive right, then requires more than merely not acting; positive rights impose on us the duty to help sustain the welfare of those who are in need of help.

#### Violation: They defend X which is a negative right.

#### Standards:

#### Ground- Overwhelming national consensus that the negative right to housing should and does exist. That’s proven by the Fair Housing Act and many other laws that prevent discrimination like VAWA. This implies that the only actual point of disagreement in the topic lit is on the implementation of further positive rights- that’s empirically proven through legal debates on this topic such as constitutional obligations. This is key to ensuring neg ground- otherwise no authors will ever take up positions against your aff. Your interp forces me to argue things like discrimination in housing good. Ground controls the internal link to any other fairness claim- they rely on the resolving of their standard to lead to original equity.

#### Field context. the overwhelming majority of the literature sees the right to housing as an issue of social welfare.

Bo Bengtsson 01 (Uppsala University, Department of Government and Institute for Housing and Urban Research). “Housing as a Social Right: Implications for Welfare State Theory”. Nordic Political Science Association, 2001.

The article contributes to two central and interrelated discourses in welfare state theory and housing policy. One concerns the meaning of a `right to housing', and the other concerns the meaning of the dichotomy `universal'^`selective' in housing policy. **The right to housing is best seen as a** political `marker of concern' pointing out housing as an area for **welfare** state **policy.** The more precise meaning of the idea is always de¢ned socially, in a speci¢c national context of relations between state, citizen, and markets in housing provision. Two alternative interpretations of a right to housing are suggested, each related to a certain logic of housing provision. In a selective housing policy, the state provides a `protected' complement to the general housing market, and the right to housing implies some legalistic minimum rights for households of lesser means. In a universal housing policy, **the state provides correctives to the general housing market in order to make housing available to all types of households, and the right to housing is best seen as a social right in** Marshall's meaning of an **obligation of the state towards society** as a whole. The concepts of `universal' and `selective' may be applied to either the political discourse or the social outcome of policies. Furthermore, they may refer to di¡erent political levels (e.g. welfare state level, sector level, and policy instrument level). If the dichotomy is not speci¢ed in those two respects, the distinction between a universal and a selective policy will always be seriously blurred.

#### Field context outweighs—word mean different things in different contexts, so only my interp is specific to how the term of art “right to housing” is used. Even if the words can be defined independently of each other, that is not how it used in literature. Comes first since we need to be able to agree to what the terms in the resolution mean before we can debate about it.

#### Limits- They explode aff limits—negative rights are defined as your right to act on something, so anything that interferes with the ability of someone to obtain a house would be offense for the aff. For example, the negative right interpretation would justify an aff that passes a policy to fight global warming since it would prevent the sea level from rising and thus allow people to live in coastal cities. Limits is an independent voter and precludes under norm setting—infinite affs means that it is impossible to set a norm for debate and neg can never engage since I cant prep the aff.

## Implementation is bad

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend the resolution as a state of affairs- i.e. that the government has an obligation to guarantee the right in the abstract. They cannot specify particular mechanisms to implement the right to housing or policies.

#### Violation: You defend [x] implementation mechanism.

#### Standards:

#### Limits- There are many too many ways to implement policies that would give people access to housing- you can defend shelters, vouchers, public projects, government apartments, micro-units, redlining, forced eviction prevention etc- your interp allows literally hundreds of affs and there’s no way I could prep or predict for all of them ahead of time. The abuse is further worsened by the fact that TFA is the first tournament on the topic for pretty much all of us- there’s no way we can have decided as a community what plan affs were common or fair enough to be allowed, meaning everyone’s in the dark. Err neg- they’re always biased by competitive incentive to find the most unpredictable arguments in the vicinity of the topic. **That’s a voting issue for procedural fairness- limits ensure that I have a legitimate chance to prep and engage your aff.**

#### Textuality- debating the right to housing is a question of determining whether the right is good in the abstract, not specific policies.

**King 03** King, Peter. "Housing as a Freedom Right." *Housing Studies* 18.5 (2003): 661-72. Web.

**Before proceeding any further there is a need to** make a terminological distinction, and in so doing, **separate out statutory and philosophical notions of rights**. This paper is more properly discussing **the ‘right to housing’. This is a moral right that may or may not exist. It is a normative condition that relates to the legitimate interests that individuals have.** This is to be distinguished from ‘housing rights’, which relate to conditions granted by statute. The notion of housing rights is, of course, quite commonly referred to. Indeed, there are many texts that aim to explain what rights individuals have to housing and associated benefits, usually produced by professional and lobbying bodies such as the Chartered Institute of Housing and Shelter. Whilst these are obviously useful, they are concerned with what could be called ‘statutory rights’. They seek to elucidate what an individual might be entitled to in law, with the specific aim of acting as guides for practitioners. However, what this **practice-based literature does not do is discuss how rights to housing are grounded. These texts cannot tell us why rights themselves are important.** This work has already been assumed to have been done, in the sense that it was deemed necessary to enact statutes. Nor can this statutory notion tell us whether rights are, of themselves, a sufficient condition. More practically, **they are also unable to inform us of what grounds there might be to extend or to reduce statutory rights, except in the narrow sense of whether particular statutes are effective.** Discussions on statutory rights tend to be question-begging, in that they take for granted that rights exist, and that therefore action is necessary by the state to institutionalise them and then to act upon them. But what **we need to know is *why* rights exist and thus why it is that governments have felt the need to legislate for them. This initially necessitates an abstract discussion, which defines rights and how they might be categorised.**

#### Impacts: a) arguments about how the right to housing entails implementation are not competitive with King, my argument is that while establishing a right to housing might lead to implementation debating government obligations in the abstract is a pre-requisite to this b) my interp sets the truth conditions for what is necessary to prove governments have an obligation to prove the right to housing meaning if you don’t meet this you’re not really proving the government should guarantee a right to housing, just some random plan that is a consequent of saying the right to housing is good should be implemented.

## Espec

#### Interpretation: The aff must explicitly specify in the form of a plan text how the aff implements a right to housing. To clarify, they must specify the specific method of enforcement for the right to housing.

#### Violation: They don’t.

#### Vote Neg:

#### There are multiple ways to implement a right to housing based on current demands.

Schiller ’15. Ben Schiller '15 (Ben Schiller is a New York staff writer for Co.Exist. He edited a European management magazine and was a reporter in San Francisco, Prague and Brussels.), 2-6-2015, "4 Ways To Make Housing More Affordable," Co.Exist, http://www.fastcoexist.com/3037614/4-ways-to-make-housing-more-affordable

If you thought big cities like New York, Mumbai, and London were unaffordable already, here's a depressing prediction: It's going to get worse. A new report forecasts a growing shortage of reasonably priced housing in the coming decades, based on current migration and income trends. **The McKinsey Global Institute estimates that by 2025 1.6 billion people—or 440 million households—will either be "financially stretched by housing costs" or be living in "crowded, inadequate, and unsafe housing."** McKinsey defines affordable as 30% of income, and its 440 million figure includes 200 million existing households in developing countries, 32 million households in advanced economies living in substandard housing, and 100 million households that are finding it hard to meet their costs. On top of that, it expects 106 million households to join the ranks of the "stretched" by 2025. That has huge implications for society, the report says: **For families lacking decent affordable housing, health outcomes are poorer, children do less well in school and tend to drop out earlier, unemployment and under-employment rates are higher, and financial inclusion is lower.** So what's to be done? McKinsey's overriding point is that **traditional approaches are likely to fail. Handing out income support or subsidies will be inadequate. Cities need to take "market-based approaches" that "create value while reducing costs."** Below are the four approaches the report recommends: UNLOCK LAND The best thing cities can do is to **make more land available for housing, preferably land that puts poor people near opportunities.** Siting affordable housing on the outskirts of town runs the risk of cementing poverty, rather than alleviating it. McKinsey recommends cities pursue transit-oriented development (housing built around new lines and stations), open up unused public land, and have policies designed to get development started quicker (like higher taxes for land that sits idle). "Inclusionary planning," meanwhile, allows developers to build more densely in return for commitments to make more affordable housing available. VALUE ENGINEERING McKinsey says **improving the productivity of the construction industry would also help make more housing units available** (it's been falling behind other industries). Here the report recommends standardizing more aspects of home design, and doing more construction off-site then wheeling it into place. "The off-site manufacturing process improves quality and enables the developer to shrink schedules by having parts delivered as needed, rather than waiting for them to be fabricated on site," the report says. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE **Driving down the cost of maintaining and operating buildings might also help make more homes available.** Ways to do that include focusing on energy efficiency (new windows, insulation and so on) **and** scaling up service operators to make them bigger and more cost competitive. BETTER FINANCING **Cities can [also] help lower-income residents afford new homes by minimizing barriers to finance**, particularly in the developing world. The report suggests three ways: reducing the cost of issuing mortgages (by, for example, standardizing the way properties are valued), reducing the cost of funding mortgages, and setting up mandatory savings funds that offer below-market interest rates. Affordable housing may be a dry topic (and the report is a little dry) but it's a vitally important one affecting billions of people. McKinsey believes its four approaches can meet the housing gap for everyone earning 50% to 80% of median income, while those earning less will also need additional support. "Despite efforts to address the affordable housing gap, it continues to grow and its effects are spreading, potentially causing greater harm to citizens and economies," says the report.

#### You need to spec in order for anyone to understand what the right even means.

**Hartman 98** Chester. (Hartman is Executive Director of the Poverty & Race Research Action Council in Washington, DC.) "The Case for a Right to Housing." Housing Policy Debate 9.2 (1998): 223-41. Web. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b39f/779ea88791e8f08dbb1351ec060ab6439085.pdf>.

**What are the components of this right**? I would include affordability, physical quality of the unit, and the social and physical characteristics of the neighborhood environment. **What should the affordability standard be**? Some version of Michael Stone’s (1993) ‘‘shelter poverty’’ standard is best, taking into account household size, household income, and the cost of nonshelter basics, as opposed to a fixed percentage of income **What standards should be used for housing and neighborhood conditions?** Local housing **codes vary enormously in coverage, detail, and standards**. The best of these might form the basis for a national code, or HUD’s Housing Quality Standards might be used. **There are few usable neighborhood quality standards at present, and serious work must be undertaken to develop these.** Overcrowding standards must guard, on the one hand, against cultural bias (Myers, Baer, and Choi 1996; Pader 1994) and, on the other hand, against accepting dramatically lower standards for the poor. **Provision must be made for changing or rising standards. Antidiscrimination requirements should permit choice of neighborhoods:** the option of in-place as well as dispersion remedies for badly impacted inner-city neighborhoods.Secure tenure should be a key element. Provision should be made, however, for legitimate changes in land use and for an owner’s business reasons that require removal of residents. Defined behavioral infractions can constitute grounds for eviction. Willful nonpayment would be grounds for eviction or foreclosure, but systems should be established to provide needed emergency and longer-term subsidies if incomes are inadequate to pay contracted housing costs, in order to avoid loss of one’s home.

#### Impacts:

#### a) Kills resolvability --- if the aff is ahead on one method being good and the neg on another being bad, there’s no way to weigh. Speccing solves since it’s an equal starting point --- independent voter since every debater needs a winner.

#### b) Debatability --- we need to know what we’re debating about for any offense comparison to take place which outweighs since whether your interp is better for fairness or education is irrelevant if we can’t access that interp to debate.

#### c) Different consequences are based on specific policy actions, i.e. an aff that just gives everyone houses would bite into the econ DA, but other affs don’t. I can’t challenge affs and get access to different args without knowing how it’s done.

#### d) **Fiat Abuse-** Not defending enforcement is the equivalent of fiating your solvency. I need to know what types of punitive action or any other type of action would be taken against offenders of the law. Otherwise I cannot link any disads or put defense on your ability to solve.

#### Kills **fairness-** Everyone can agree that homelessness is awful, but I cannot contest how the AC solves, then the only ground I am left with is morally repugnant. Ground skew key to fairness since the entirety of debate is premised on the ability to make and interact arguments.

## Group spec

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend a policy that guarantees a right to housing for all people unconditionally. To clarify, you cannot defend giving housing to specific groups.

#### Violation: You spec inter-partner violence. That’s CX.

#### Net Benefits:

#### Limits- Their interp massively underlimits the number of affs; the aff can cherry-pick any group of people in any region wich any enforcement mechanism, which results in a permutation of hundreds of thousands of affs. You can defend trans shelters in New York, giving surfers shacks in LA, preventing IPV survivor eviction in Kansas, etc or anty litany of ridiculous affs. Abuse is worsened by the fact this is the first real nat tournament on the topic for most people meaning breaking new and unpredictable models for debate will run rampant. Limits is an independent voter and precludes under norm setting—infinite affs means that it is impossible to set a norm for debate and neg can never engage since I cant prep the aff.

#### Field Context- The right to housing implies that you have to guarantee the right to all people.

**NESRI** <https://www.nesri.org/programs/what-is-the-human-right-to-housing> What is the Human Right to Housing?

Everyone has **a fundamental human right to housing**, which **ensures access to a safe, secure, habitable, and affordable home** with freedom from forced eviction. It is the government’s obligation to guarantee that **everyone can exercise** this right to live in security, peace, and dignity. **This right must be provided to all persons** irrespective of income or access to economic resources. There are seven principles that are fundamental to the right to housing and are of particular relevance to the right to housing in the United States:

#### Field context outweighs—word mean different things in different contexts, so only my interp is specific to how the term of art “right to housing” is used. Even if the words can be defined independently of each other, that is not how it used in literature.

## Defend implementation

#### Interp: The aff must defend the passage of a post-fiat policy action in which the right to housing is guaranteed.

#### The right to housing requires POLICY action.

**HRRC** The Right to Adequate Housing, [USING MODULE 13 IN A TRAINING PROGRAM](http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/edumat/IHRIP/circle/part2/MODULE13.HTM), [http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/edumat/IHRIP/circle/modules/module13.htm](http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/edumat/IHRIP/circle/modules/module13.htm%20//)

State obligations vis-a-vis **the right to adequate housing** are frequently misunderstood. They **do[es] not mean that the state is required to build housing for the entire population**, or that housing should be provided free of charge to the populace, or even that this right will manifest itself in the same manner in all places at all times. **Rather, recognition of the right** to housing by a state **means**: **The state undertakes** to endeavor by all appropriate **means to ensure that everyone has access to** affordable and acceptable **housing**. **[and] the state will undertake** a series of measures which indicate **policy and legislative recognition of** each of the constituent aspects of **the right** to housing. The state will protect and improve houses and neighborhoods rather than damage or destroy them. The essential elements of the state’s obligation to implement all ESC rights (including the right to adequate housing) are encapsulated under article 2(1) of the ICESCR.

#### And guarantee implies a concrete action or solution.

**Merriam Webster** https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/guarantee

**to engage for the existence, permanence, or nature of :  undertake to do or secure**

#### Government-guaranteed right to housing entails implementation, including enacting laws and creating agencies to ensure the right.

**Golay and Ozden 07** [Christophe Golay and Melik Özden (advisor to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food; Director of the CETIM's Human Rights Programme and permanent representative of the CETIM to the United Nations). “The Right To Housing.” CETIM. 2007. <http://www.cetim.ch/legacy/en/documents/bro7-log-A4-an.pdf>]

3. The Obligation to Protect the Right to Adequate Housing. **The obligation to protect the right to adequate housing requires that governments** prohibit third parties from preventing the enjoyment of the right to housing in any way. This applies to individuals, business enterprises and other entities. Governments must, for example, **enact laws that protect the population from** land and property **speculation. They must create** competent **bodies to investigate violations and must assure** the means of effective **redress** for victims, most notably **through** access to the **courts.** Governments must also **intervene when powerful individuals or business enterprises evict persons** from their land or their housing, **by bringing to law those responsible** and by guaranteeing restitution and/or compensation for the victims. The Special Rapporteur on the Right to Adequate Housing, in several of his reports, has denounced the negative effects of the privatization of public services.41 He emphasizes that the government has the duty to guarantee, for example, that privatization of water will not have negative effects on access to water and to adequate housing for the population. Such privatization has very often entailed price increases that have made water unaffordable for the poorest. In Manila, for example, the price of water quadrupled between 1997 and 2003 after the privatization carried out by Lyonnaise des Eaux.42 In all cases of privatization of public services, including water or electricity, the government must continue to guarantee the protection of the right to adequate housing, including/especially for the poorest. The government is also responsible for intervening to avoid all discrimination in access to housing. A government that does not, for example, guarantee that no person shall be refused housing because of his/her sex, nationality or origin, nor prevent other forms of discrimination, violates its duty to protect the right to housing.

#### Violation: You don’t.

#### Vote Neg;

#### Ground- they get to just fiat solvency and just prove the squo is bad which is obviously meaning the aff wins as a general principle every time. The only neg ground on this topic concerns implementation in the real world- meeting my interp would give me better access to certain DAs because I would know how the plan is implemented. because you refuse to defend implementation. I can’t go for crime da, econ da, specific CP’s, solvency turns, etc in order to answer the aff, you’ll just delink my offense in the 1ar by claiming implementation is irrelevant. Ground key to fairness- I need equal access to arguments to have equal access to the ballot.

#### Field Context- my interp is key to understanding what the resolution means in the context of governments. Even if the right to housing is an abstract principle, when governments guarantee the action, that necessitates specific policy discussions. Additionally, the HRRC evidence is phenomenal on this- it reviews all of the topic lit and determines specifically what the definition means over years of discussion. This is also empirically proven in the context of your our Golay and Ozden evidence- government policy debates over the right to housing are abstract even if rights are abstract. Field context is key to jurisdiction- words mean different things in different context, so only my interp contextualizes what you can vote off of in the context of the resolution.

#### Topical version of the aff- just defend implementation. Solves your offense. Even if your framework is intent based you can still defend the passage of a policy- there’s no reason the two conflict.