**AFF Answers**

Remember to F-STOP!

When answering the K remember you want to “F-STOP” the K. Always make the following arguments:

**Framework** – defend why your affirmative matters and the methodology behind your affirmative

**Solvency** – You need to make an argument that the Alternative does not solve the affirmative

**Theory** – You should have a theoretical objection to the K. If there is also a counterplan/DA strategy in the round that should be conditionality. If the K is being framed as a Floating PIK you also need to defend against that.

**Offense** – Have offensive reasons that your affirmative is good. These function as disadvantages to the alternative

**Permutation** – You should always perm the K. The best perms take the language of the alternative and also advocate the affirmative. If you cannot figure out how to write that language the next best idea is to say: “perm do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alternative.”

**Framework – Engage with the Real**

**Engaging with the physical is necessary to avoid reproducing the status quo.**

**Bryant 12** Professor of philosophy at Collin College (Levi, We’ll Never Do Better Than a Politician: Climate Change and Purity, 5/11/12, http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/05/11/well-never-do-better-than-a-politician-climate-change-and-purity/)

However, pointing this out and deriding market based solutions doesn’t get us very far. In fact, such a response to proposed market-based solutions is downright dangerous and irresponsible. The fact of the matter is that 1) we currently live in a market based world, 2) there is not, in the foreseeable future an alternative system on the horizon, and 3), above all, we need to do something now. We can’t afford to reject interventions simply because they don’t meet our ideal conceptions of how things should be. We have to work with the world that is here, not the one that we would like to be here. And here it’s crucial to note that pointing this out does not entail that we shouldn’t work for producing that other world. It just means that we have to grapple with the world that is actually there before us.¶ It pains me to write this post because I remember, with great bitterness, the diatribes hardcore Obama supporters leveled against legitimate leftist criticisms on the grounds that these critics were completely unrealistic idealists who, in their demand for “purity”, were asking for “ponies and unicorns”. This rejoinder always seemed to ignore that words have power and that Obama, through his profound power of rhetoric, had, at least the power to shift public debates and frames, opening a path to making new forms of policy and new priorities possible. The tragedy was that he didn’t use that power, though he has gotten better.

**Solvency**

**Extend your affirmative plan here, tying an explanation into why the judge should prefer your argument below. Consider the following questions:**

* Why would your plan be better than the alternative method the negative proposes?
* Why is it important to solve for the affirmative?
* Does prioritizing conceptual violence over actual violence truly benefit anyone?

**Offense**

**Strategic action is key – the alternative only recreates the most violent aspects of their impact claims. Only through urgent, real action can we hope to solve any of their impacts.**

**Liotta ’15** (P.H. Liotta Professor of Humanities at Salve Regina University, Newport, RI, and Executive Director of the Pell Center for International Relations and Public Policy) 2005 “Through the Looking Glass” Sage Publications

Although it seems attractive to focus on exclusionary concepts that insist on desecuritization, privileged referent objects, and the ‘belief’ that threats and vulnerabilities are little more than social constructions (Grayson, 2003), all these concepts work in theory but fail in practice. While it may be true that national security paradigms can, and likely will, continue to dominate issues that involve human security vulnerabilities – and even in some instances mistakenly confuse ‘vulnerabilities’ as ‘threats’ – there are distinct linkages between these security concepts and applications. With regard to environmental security, for example, Myers (1986: 251) recognized these linkages nearly two decades ago: National security is not just about fighting forces and weaponry. It relates to watersheds, croplands, forests, genetic resources, climate and other factors that rarely figure in the minds of military experts and political leaders, but increasingly deserve, in their collectivity, to rank alongside military approaches as crucial in a nation’s security. Ultimately, we are far from what O’Hanlon & Singer (2004) term a global intervention capability on behalf of ‘humanitarian transformation’. Granted, we now have the threat of mass casualty terrorism anytime, anywhere – and states and regions are responding differently to this challenge. Yet, the global community today also faces many of the same problems of the 1990s: civil wars, faltering states, humanitarian crises. We are nowhere closer toaddressing how best to solve these challenges, even as they affect issues of environmental, human, national (and even ‘embedded’) security. Recently, there have been a number of voices that have spoken out on what the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty has termed the ‘responsibility to protect’:10 the responsibility of some agency or state (whether it be a superpower such as the United States or an institution such as the United Nations) to enforce the principle of security that sovereign states owe to their citizens. Yet, the creation of a sense of urgency to act – even on some issues that may not have some impact for years or even decades to come – is perhaps the only appropriate first response. The real cost of not investing in the right way and early enough in the places where trends and effects are accelerating in the wrong direction is likely to be decades and decades of economic and political frustration – and, potentially, military engagement.

**Permutation**

1. **The affirmative proposes that we perm: Doing both the aff plantext and negative alternative method.**
2. **While our affirmative resolves material impacts, the negatives’ method solves structural ones.**
3. **Cross-apply Bryant 12 and prefer our framing of the round – We have no choice but to engage with the material world.**