## I Meet

I meet. My version of the PP fiats policy guidelines – that’s Collins 5.

I meet. He has no definition saying the aff must be a single policy instead of a set of policies.

I meet. Implementation of the PP directly mandates court-enforceable risk assessment.

**Wibisana 11**

Andri G Wibisana (Lecturer of the Law Faculty of Universitas Indonesia). “The Development of the Precautionary Principle in International and in Indonesian Environmental Law.” Asia Pacific Journal of Environmental Law, Vol. 14(1 & 2), 2011. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2131666

Early **experience of implementing the p**recautionary **p**rinciple in Indonesia **illustrates that the principle is manifested in the obligation to conduct risk assessment. This** type of **implentation** of the precautionary principle **can be clearly seen in the decisions of** District and High Administrative **Courts** on the Kapas Transgenik case and in Government Regulation No 21 of 2005.

## Counter-Interp

Counter-Interp – The aff should defend the precautionary principle, i.e. my plan.

**1.** The PP lit is not about specific policies. Debating the PP is key to topic education, that’s Schettler and Raffensperger 4.

Topic phil education outweighs – that’s Samuelsson 10. Eco ethics is key to environmental policy.

**2.** Predictable limits. Specific policies blow the lid off the topic. There are over one hundred DCs, tons of resources, and infinite solvency mechanisms. General principle means negs get stock ground regardless of the aff.

Predictable limits control the link to fairness and education because it’s key to pre-round prep.

**3.** I’m most textual – that’s Nebel. Textuality controls the link to predictability and ground.

Prefer topic analysis to single words because the whole sentence determines a word’s context.

[optional]

**DOLLEY 84**

(Steven D. Dolley, Nuclear Control Institute's research director, former Debate Coach at Bates College and the University of Vermont, where “Topicality: Is it Reasonable to be Reasonable”, 1984—Waging War on Poverty, http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/ DRGArticles/Dolley1984Poverty.htm)

A second determinant of context in the sentence is grammar. Many words serve different grammatical functions in different situations, and their meaning shifts drastically from one context to another. The work "all" is illustrative. When used as an adjective, it means "the whole amount or Quantity of,"21 as we are well aware. When a knife-wielding felon says, "Give me all your money," you had best hand over the entirety of your cash if you wish to acknowledge the literal meaning of his statement and avoid internal bleeding. However, "all" works quite differently when it becomes an adverb, meaning in that situation "entirely; totally; altogether."22 To eat all-beef patties does not mean to gorge oneself on every burger in the world, and to be voted All-American does not transform a quarterback into every US citizen. To define a word being used as one part of speech when it is being used as another renders the word less than useless. Third, the syntactical structure of the sentence must be accounted for. Some words have different definitions in different types of sentences. The word "any" is one such word, as college debaters learned a few years ago. Zeno Vendler, a logician at Cornell University, used the example of a basket of apples and the statement "Take any." Here the syntactical context is permissive, and as Vendler stressed, "any" cannot mean "all": I said, 'Take any.' Do you want to suggest that short of taking all you did not accept the offer? No, I say, taking all would be an abuse of it. Your requirement of completeness clashes, once more, with the freedom of choice of 'any..'23 If the sentence were altered to make it prohibitive rather than permissive, it would read "Do not take any." Here, "any's" function would be similar to "all" i.e., all apples are denied to you. Debaters must be cautious when dealing with these subtle but significant shifts in meaning. Often extensive research in dictionaries, encyclopedias, compilations of legal definitions such as *Words and Phrases*, and grammar texts will be necessary. An affirmative relying on first glance impressions, or gut feelings about what the framers must have meant, will drop many topicality ballots to a team that has methodically explored the implications of the resolution's syntax.

## A2 Standards

### AT Advocacy Shift

1. CX solves ambiguities.

2. Ex post facto theory solves. If the 1AR shifts, you could read theory in the 2NR. Don’t punish me for what I didn’t do.

3. TURN – the PP is the most stable plan because it’s enshrined in multiple international laws.

4. TURN – I could shift out of generic disads with the nuances of my plan which is worse for the neg – proved by the aff bias in policy debate.

5. Infinitely regressive. I could always clarify further. An advocacy statement with a solvency advocate is the only logical brightline.

### AT Predictability

1. Wiki solves predictability. It’s the TOC. I’ve been reading PP for five months.

2. TURN – Principles are most predictable since everyone knows the resolution beforehand whereas debaters can’t predict every solvency mechanism for EP.

3. There are over 100 plans on the wiki. There’s no way you predicted the Asbestos mining plan or the Aral Sea restoration plan.

### AT Ground

1. TURN – There’s tons of topic lit about general principles – that’s Samuelsson. Not my fault you didn’t cut it.

2. TURN – his interp gives him infinite disads because the topic’s unlimited – that’s above.

3. TURN – aff ground skew is good because it compensates for time skew.

4. Even if policies differ, there are still general advantages and disadvantages as proven by all my contentions.

5. Limits turn ground. Your theoretical disad ground is useless if you don’t have pre-round prep to cut it.

6. My advocacy text is pretty much the topic. If he couldn’t predict that he should have disads to the topic, that’s not my fault.

### AT Counter-plan Ground

1. You have no right to a non-competitive counter-plan.

2. Cross-apply the limits impact. He could PIC out of any one policy in any one country which unlimits aff prep.

3. He gets any counter-principle like erring toward RE or direct CBA. There’s tons of lit that offers alternatives to PP.

### AT Real World/Education

1. TURN— I outweigh on portability. Principles apply to everyone, but none of us are developing country policy makers.

2. TURN— theory ensures zero topic education. Allowing me to read a sub-optimal plan is still better.

3. TURN—wrong forum. Policy and public forum give you policy education. LD is the only forum for philosophy.

4. I control uniqueness. The other 3 topics this year were policy-focused.

5. Turn – in real-world policy, resolutions are general beliefs and bills are laws.

**MFA 10**

Maine Forensic Association Congressional Debate Manual 2010-2011. http://www.maineforensic.com/documents/events-congress/Maine\_Congressional\_Debate\_Manual\_-\_Updated.pdf

Resolution Support or condemn a certain action (or inaction) without the force of law; or state the general opinion of the Congress. 1. They are usually **generalized statements expressing the belief of the group** adopting them, and they do **not** have **the force of law.** A resolution is the government going on record stating that something should be done about the problem. 2. Resolutions have the same requirements as bills with the following exceptions: a. Resolutions begin: “Be it resolved by the Student Congress here assembled that…” b. Resolutions may include whereas clauses. Whereas clauses provide the principle for adopting the resolution

5. Philosophy turns real world education.

**Shammas 12** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

The past year gives one the suspicion that American society is dysfunctional. Our **Congress is useless**, our institutions inept. **Faced with the terror of existence, young men** like Adam Lanza **react with violence. Faced with** manageable problems such as **a "fiscal cliff," our democracy self-destructs.** Anger is everywhere; understanding is nowhere. Although a **democratic society cannot function unless** its **citizens** are able to **rationally debate** one another, rationality is missing from American politics. We assail our political enemies with intractable opinions and self-righteous anger. An ugly bitterness pervades everything. Meanwhile, our country is slowly but surely committing suicide. It seems to me that this dysfunctional political dialogue, which stems from the iron certainty we grant our opinions, is the most pressing problem confronting 21st century America. In fact, it is a crisis. For without the ability to carry on a useful dialogue, we cannot solve our greatest challenges, or even our smallest ones. This raises the question: How can we solve this crisis? Because the capacity to debate requires the capacity to think, I believe the answer lies in philosophy. Why philosophy? Because the study of **philosophy**, the "love of wisdom," creates and **nurtures thoughtful minds**, minds **that can** -- as Aristotle suggests -- **entertain a thought without accepting it.** With a philosophic worldview, a Republican who despises any tax increase or economic stimulus could at least consider the notion of tax hikes or Keynesian economics. A Democrat facing antithetical ideas could do likewise. Thought rather than anger could become the default response to opposing worldviews. Indeed, philosophy can do a great deal to lessen the anger that is growing like a cancerous tumor in modern America. The tools exist in both Eastern and Western thought -- in the Stoic exhortation to accept the present as it is, in Buddhist meditation, in the Humanist's transcendent appeal to reason, in Kant's categorical imperative. Philosophy can help us inculcate virtue for, in the words of Socrates, "knowledge is virtue." While some philosophies obviously conduce toward peace more than others, while some philosophers (Marcus Aurelius) seem kinder than others (Nietzsche), the open-minded study of different philosophies at least opens one up to the possibility that one is wrong. **One realizes**, like Socrates did, **that knowledge is anything but certain**, that true wisdom lies in realizing how much one does not know, in understanding that our knowledge of the universe (and therefore of earthly things like politics) is utterly inadequate, perhaps comparable to the area of a pin's tip against a table. **This** realization **makes one less angry** when confronted **with opposing views**, replacing counterproductive anger with productive curiosity. Despite the benefits of the philosophic mindset, we do not cultivate this mindset in our children. In fact, **philosophy is** almost entirely **absent from** American **schools.** […] [Ellipsed text on comp. Available at request.] So my point is this: **Our** diseased **political system is in dire need** of a hefty dose **of philosophy, and the best way** to inject this dose into American society **is** to start at the stem -- **to raise** our **children to have a philosophic mindset** by teaching philosophy in schools. In the process we will, slowly but surely, be raising Americans who possess the capacity to respond to problems with inquisitive rather than angry minds, perhaps ending this suicidal gridlock.

### AT Textuality (1)

1. Most topic words are in my plan, so I can’t violate. It’s just a question of what the plan means.

2. My interp combines all words. The topic as a whole means my aff – that’s Nebel.

Prefer topic analysis to single words because the whole sentence determines a word’s context.

**DOLLEY 84**

(Steven D. Dolley, Nuclear Control Institute's research director, former Debate Coach at Bates College and the University of Vermont, where “Topicality: Is it Reasonable to be Reasonable”, 1984—Waging War on Poverty, http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/ DRGArticles/Dolley1984Poverty.htm)

A second determinant of context in the sentence is grammar. Many words serve different grammatical functions in different situations, and their meaning shifts drastically from one context to another. The work "all" is illustrative. When used as an adjective, it means "the whole amount or Quantity of,"21 as we are well aware. When a knife-wielding felon says, "Give me all your money," you had best hand over the entirety of your cash if you wish to acknowledge the literal meaning of his statement and avoid internal bleeding. However, "all" works quite differently when it becomes an adverb, meaning in that situation "entirely; totally; altogether."22 To eat all-beef patties does not mean to gorge oneself on every burger in the world, and to be voted All-American does not transform a quarterback into every US citizen. To define a word being used as one part of speech when it is being used as another renders the word less than useless. Third, the syntactical structure of the sentence must be accounted for. Some words have different definitions in different types of sentences. The word "any" is one such word, as college debaters learned a few years ago. Zeno Vendler, a logician at Cornell University, used the example of a basket of apples and the statement "Take any." Here the syntactical context is permissive, and as Vendler stressed, "any" cannot mean "all": I said, 'Take any.' Do you want to suggest that short of taking all you did not accept the offer? No, I say, taking all would be an abuse of it. Your requirement of completeness clashes, once more, with the freedom of choice of 'any..'23 If the sentence were altered to make it prohibitive rather than permissive, it would read "Do not take any." Here, "any's" function would be similar to "all" i.e., all apples are denied to you. Debaters must be cautious when dealing with these subtle but significant shifts in meaning. Often extensive research in dictionaries, encyclopedias, compilations of legal definitions such as *Words and Phrases*, and grammar texts will be necessary. An affirmative relying on first glance impressions, or gut feelings about what the framers must have meant, will drop many topicality ballots to a team that has methodically explored the implications of the resolution's syntax.

3. A specific policy forces me to violate “countries” plural.

4. I turn common usage of EP. My aff is literally the Wikipedia intro to EP.

**Wikipedia no date.**

Wikipedia. “Environmental Protection.” No date. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental\_protection

**E**nvironmental **p**rotection **is influenced by** three interwoven factors: environmental legislation, **ethics** and education. Each of these factors plays its part in **influencing national**-level **environmental** decisions **and personal**-level **environmental values** and behaviors. **For e**nvironmental **p**rotection to become a reality, **it is important** for societies **to develop** each of **these areas** that, **together**, will inform and drive environmental decisions.

5. Resolved is not an action, but a determination to act. “Firmly determined to do something” is the first definition on Google.

(Google. No date. [Just google “resolved.”])

**AT Textuality (2)**

6. I turn real-world policy. Resolutions are general beliefs; bills are laws.

**MFA 10**

Maine Forensic Association Congressional Debate Manual 2010-2011. http://www.maineforensic.com/documents/events-congress/Maine\_Congressional\_Debate\_Manual\_-\_Updated.pdf

Resolution Support or condemn a certain action (or inaction) without the force of law; or state the general opinion of the Congress. 1. They are usually **generalized statements expressing the belief of the group** adopting them, and they do **not** have **the force of law.** A resolution is the government going on record stating that something should be done about the problem. 2. Resolutions have the same requirements as bills with the following exceptions: a. Resolutions begin: “Be it resolved by the Student Congress here assembled that…” b. Resolutions may include whereas clauses. Whereas clauses provide the principle for adopting the resolution

7. Turn – only weak principles like the aff meet “should.” A strong obligation like a policy would use “ought.”

**Asperic 6** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

"Ought to" has the same intention as "should", that is to suggest something, but "ought to" says that you think that a person should pay more attention to your suggestion to give more importance to it. "**Ought** to" **is more specific than "should", more forcible.** **Their meaning both point to the same direction, the** basic **difference is in the degree of expressiveness.** "**ought** to" **is far closer to** "**there is nothing else**/better to do but/except to" **than "should"** (However there are several usages of "ought to" that are not the same as "should', I am talking here only about the part where they are similar in meaning.) So, yes, we could say that there are situations when "ought to" and "should" mean almost the same, but the intention of a speaker or writer is different: to indicate a solution or to give a suggestion, respectively. The difference between "ought to" and "should", when they mean "giving a suggestion", is better understood when you examine expressions and examples. **For example if I like a cake very much** and I want to suggest someone to try it **I would say: "You ought to try this cake."** In this case if we use **"You should try this cake"**, it **says not much about how strong I liked it.** **If someone is leaving the house after the diner, a polite way to invite him again is "You ought to visit** us **again."** In this case if we use **"You should visit** us **again"**, it **does not give that strong expectation**. With "you ought to visit us again" you compliment to the person that has visited you far more than with "you should visit us again". **"ought to" is sometimes a synonym to "cannot avoid". "should" is almost never a synonym to "cannot avoid".**

## A2 Definitions

### General

My interp combines all words. The topic as a whole means my aff – that’s Nebel.

### Resolved

I meet. Resolved is not an action, but a determination to act. “Firmly determined to do something” is the first definition on Google.

(Source: Google it.)

Prefer it because the topic framers intended LD as a values debate.

I turn real-world policy. Resolutions are general beliefs; bills are laws.

**MFA 10**

Maine Forensic Association Congressional Debate Manual 2010-2011. http://www.maineforensic.com/documents/events-congress/Maine\_Congressional\_Debate\_Manual\_-\_Updated.pdf

Resolution Support or condemn a certain action (or inaction) without the force of law; or state the general opinion of the Congress. 1. They are usually **generalized statements expressing the belief of the group** adopting them, and they do **not** have **the force of law.** A resolution is the government going on record stating that something should be done about the problem. 2. Resolutions have the same requirements as bills with the following exceptions: a. Resolutions begin: “Be it resolved by the Student Congress here assembled that…” b. Resolutions may include whereas clauses. Whereas clauses provide the principle for adopting the resolution

### DCs

A specific policy forces me to violate “countries” plural.

### Should

My plan says should.

Turn – only weak principles like the aff meet “should.” A strong obligation like a policy would use “ought.”

**Asperic 6** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

"Ought to" has the same intention as "should", that is to suggest something, but "ought to" says that you think that a person should pay more attention to your suggestion to give more importance to it. "**Ought** to" **is more specific than "should", more forcible.** **Their meaning both point to the same direction, the** basic **difference is in the degree of expressiveness.** "**ought** to" **is far closer to** "**there is nothing else**/better to do but/except to" **than "should"** (However there are several usages of "ought to" that are not the same as "should', I am talking here only about the part where they are similar in meaning.) So, yes, we could say that there are situations when "ought to" and "should" mean almost the same, but the intention of a speaker or writer is different: to indicate a solution or to give a suggestion, respectively. The difference between "ought to" and "should", when they mean "giving a suggestion", is better understood when you examine expressions and examples. **For example if I like a cake very much** and I want to suggest someone to try it **I would say: "You ought to try this cake."** In this case if we use **"You should try this cake"**, it **says not much about how strong I liked it.** **If someone is leaving the house after the diner, a polite way to invite him again is "You ought to visit** us **again."** In this case if we use **"You should visit** us **again"**, it **does not give that strong expectation**. With "you ought to visit us again" you compliment to the person that has visited you far more than with "you should visit us again". **"ought to" is sometimes a synonym to "cannot avoid". "should" is almost never a synonym to "cannot avoid".**

### Environmental Protection

I can’t violate EP. It’s in the plan-text.

I meet. My aff is literally the Wikipedia intro to EP. Turns common usage.

**Wikipedia no date.**

Wikipedia. “Environmental Protection.” No date. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental\_protection

**E**nvironmental **p**rotection **is influenced by** three interwoven factors: environmental legislation, **ethics** and education. Each of these factors plays its part in **influencing national**-level **environmental** decisions **and personal**-level **environmental values** and behaviors. **For e**nvironmental **p**rotection to become a reality, **it is important** for societies **to develop** each of **these areas** that, **together**, will inform and drive environmental decisions.
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