# JANFEB19 T and Theory

# ---1NC Shells---

## T – Authoritarian

### 1NC - General

#### Interpretation and Violation – topical authoritarian regimes are those listed in the EIU Democracy Index as Authoritarian Regimes - \_\_\_\_ isn’t T. I’ve inserted a list of T regimes in the doc.

EIU 18 “Democracy Index.” 2018. <https://infographics.economist.com/2018/DemocracyIndex/>

\*\*Evaluated on electoral process and pluralism; civil liberties; the functioning of government; political participation; and political culture

167=Most Authoritarian, 116=Least Authoritarian

167 North Korea 166 Syria 165 Chad 164 Central African Republic 163 Democratic Republic of Congo 162 Turkmenistan 161 Equatorial Guinea 159 Saudi Arabia 159 Tajikistan 158 Uzbekistan 157 Guinea-Bissau 156 Yemen 155 Sudan 154 Libya 153 Burundi 151 Eritrea 151 Laos 150 Iran 149 Afghanistan 148 Azerbaijan 147 United Arab Emirates 146 Bahrain 145 Djibouti 144 Swaziland 143 Oman 142 Togo 141 Kazakhstan 140 Vietnam 139 China 138 Belarus 137 Guinea 136 Zimbabwe 135 Russia 133 Rwanda 133 Qatar 132 Republic of the Congo 131 Cuba 130 Egypt 129 Ethiopia 128 Algeria 126 Cameroon 126 Gabon 125 Angola 124 Cambodia 123 Comoros 122 Niger 121 Mauritania 120 Myanmar 119 Kuwait 117 Venezuela 117 Jordan 116 Ivory Coast

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – only authoritarian regimes draws a clear line of topical affs and sets clear research burdens – anything else arbitrarily explodes limits to 148 nations

EIU 17 (“Democracy Index 2017” 2017. <https://pages.eiu.com/rs/753-RIQ-438/images/Democracy_Index_2017.pdf>) KED

Democracy Index 2017, by regime type

No. of countries % of countries % of world population

Full democracies 19 11.4 4.5

Flawed democracies 57 34.1 44.8

Hybrid regimes 39 23.4 16.7

Authoritarian regimes 52 31.1 34.0

Note. “World” population refers to the total population of the 167 countries covered by the Index. Since this excludes only micro states, this is nearly equal to the entire estimated world population.

#### And– there’s over 100 countries getting military aid

Karlin 17 (Karlin, Mara, “Why Military Assistance Programs Disappoint,” Brookings, 11/3/17, [www.brookings.edu/articles/why-military-assistance-programs-disappoint/](http://www.brookings.edu/articles/why-military-assistance-programs-disappoint/)) KED

Since the end of World War II, U.S. administrations of both parties have relied on a time-honored foreign policy tool: training and equipping foreign militaries. Seeking to stabilize fragile states, the United States has adopted this approach in nearly every region of the world over the last 70 years. Today, Washington is working with the militaries of more than 100 countries and running large programs to train and equip armed forces in such hot spots as Afghanistan, Iraq, Jordan, and Pakistan.

#### 2] Topic edu – our list answers the questions of the resolution, the EIU list draws the line on the strongest principles of political freedom which are also key to ground

EIU 17 ("Democracy Index 2017 Free Speech Under Attack," 2017, http://www.eiu.com/Handlers/WhitepaperHandler.ashx?fi=Democracy\_Index\_2017.pdf&mode=wp&campaignid=DemocracyIndex2017. Accessed 9 Dec 2018.) KED

Authoritarian regimes: In these states, state political pluralism is absent or heavily circumscribed. Many countries in this category are outright dictatorships. Some formal institutions of democracy may exist, but these have little substance. Elections, if they do occur, are not free and fair. There is disregard for abuses and infringements of civil liberties. Media are typically state-owned or controlled by groups connected to the ruling regime. There is repression of criticism of the government and pervasive censorship. There is no independent judiciary.

Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity governed by rules.

Education is a voter because it’s the only portable skill by debate and the reasons why schools fund it.

Competing interps because reasonability necessitates judge intervention and creates a race to the bottom.

No RVI because they don’t get a cookie for proving they aren’t abusive

### 1NC – Harrison Police

#### Interpretation and Violation – topical authoritarian regimes are those listed in the EIU Democracy Index as Authoritarian Regimes – The United States isn’t T. I’ve inserted a list of T regimes in the doc.

EIU 18 “Democracy Index.” 2018. <https://infographics.economist.com/2018/DemocracyIndex/>

167=Most Authoritarian, 116=Least Authoritarian

167 North Korea 166 Syria 165 Chad 164 Central African Republic 163 Democratic Republic of Congo 162 Turkmenistan 161 Equatorial Guinea 159 Saudi Arabia 159 Tajikistan 158 Uzbekistan 157 Guinea-Bissau 156 Yemen 155 Sudan 154 Libya 153 Burundi 151 Eritrea 151 Laos 150 Iran 149 Afghanistan 148 Azerbaijan 147 United Arab Emirates 146 Bahrain 145 Djibouti 144 Swaziland 143 Oman 142 Togo 141 Kazakhstan 140 Vietnam 139 China 138 Belarus 137 Guinea 136 Zimbabwe 135 Russia 133 Rwanda 133 Qatar 132 Republic of the Congo 131 Cuba 130 Egypt 129 Ethiopia 128 Algeria 126 Cameroon 126 Gabon 125 Angola 124 Cambodia 123 Comoros 122 Niger 121 Mauritania 120 Myanmar 119 Kuwait 117 Venezuela 117 Jordan 116 Ivory Coast

#### The US isn’t authoritarian – a bad president is different from a bad democracy

Nexon 18 Daniel Nexon, 1-22-2018, " Don’t call Trump a totalitarian. He’s bad enough without exaggerating." Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/posteverything/wp/2018/01/22/dont-call-trump-a-totalitarian-hes-bad-enough-without- exaggerating/?noredirect=on&utm\_term=.5accbb27136b / MM

True, Trump shows little intrinsic regard for democratic norms, values and institutions. Many Americans familiar with the rhetoric and tactics favored by leaders of authoritarian and hybrid regimes find the president and his administration deeply disquieting. But optimists, whether Trump supporters or the president’s more sanguine opponents, are right to point out that the American elections in 2017 were as free and fair as they were in 2016; the judiciary still has acted to check the executive branch; our libel laws remain the same; and plenty of functioning democracies adopt much more restrictive immigration policies than does the United States. In fact, current trends point toward a brutal 2018 for Republican officeholders. This hardly seems the stuff of authoritarianism, let alone totalitarianism.

#### Vote neg for

#### Predictable limits – their interp arbitrarily expands the resolution to as many countries as they want. Our interp answers the best question of the resolution and draws clear lines on neg ground. There’s over 100 countries getting military aid.

Karlin 17 (Karlin, Mara, “Why Military Assistance Programs Disappoint,” Brookings, 11/3/17, [www.brookings.edu/articles/why-military-assistance-programs-disappoint/](http://www.brookings.edu/articles/why-military-assistance-programs-disappoint/)) KED

Since the end of World War II, U.S. administrations of both parties have relied on a time-honored foreign policy tool: training and equipping foreign militaries. Seeking to stabilize fragile states, the United States has adopted this approach in nearly every region of the world over the last 70 years. Today, Washington is working with the militaries of more than 100 countries and running large programs to train and equip armed forces in such hot spots as Afghanistan, Iraq, Jordan, and Pakistan.

#### Topic Ed – view their offense with a grain of salt, they’ve had 4 months to talk about flawed democracies within the US and Harrison has been reading affs like this for years, IR topics offer unique opportunities to learn about often unnoticed violence in IR

EIU 17 ("Democracy Index 2017 Free Speech Under Attack," 2017, http://www.eiu.com/Handlers/WhitepaperHandler.ashx?fi=Democracy\_Index\_2017.pdf&mode=wp&campaignid=DemocracyIndex2017. Accessed 9 Dec 2018.) KED

Authoritarian regimes: In these states, state political pluralism is absent or heavily circumscribed. Many countries in this category are outright dictatorships. Some formal institutions of democracy may exist, but these have little substance. Elections, if they do occur, are not free and fair. There is disregard for abuses and infringements of civil liberties. Media are typically state-owned or controlled by groups connected to the ruling regime. There is repression of criticism of the government and pervasive censorship. There is no independent judiciary.

#### TVA – their stock aff on Harrison GC’s wiki or the Rights AC on EL’s wiki – you get all your “US is bad” offense and we get topical disads.

#### Evaluate debate through competing interps – reasonability creates a race to the bottom and encourages judge intervention

#### Impact turns aren’t a voting issue and no weighing case

#### Perfcon – if T’s bad and you vote for them on that arg, you’re voting on T.

#### Substance – if T’s bad then we should try debating on substance – impact turns force me to go for T since I need to defend my position.

#### Dead end – strategy guides debates so they’ll desire that people read T to beat them on the impact turn – that proves their strategy is reactive and can’t solve since they rely on the structures they critique.

### Violation – Israel

#### Violation: Israel isn’t authoritarian

Pfeffer 18 Anshel Pfeffer, 2-7-2018, [journalist] "A high-functioning illiberal democracy: Explaining Israel's ranking in the global democracy index," haaretz, <https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-israel-the-world-s-strongest-illiberal-democracy-1.5793036> RE

The Democracy Index’s compilers admit as much, but they’ve been publishing it annually for a decade now and refining the model, which currently aggregates 60 different indicators in five categories. Like any other statistical model it has its limitations, but a closer look at the numbers and methodology tells an interesting story as far as Israel is concerned. So what makes a democracy? According to the index, Israel scores particularly high in the “electoral process and pluralism” category. This includes holding free and fair elections where the opposition has a realistic chance, the people enjoy universal suffrage, all parties have equal opportunities to cazmpaign and the process is sufficiently transparent. On these indicators, Israel scores an average of 9.17, the third highest tally. In the “political participation” category, which measures voter turnout, levels of participation and the representation of women and minorities, the public’s engagement in politics, freedom to protest and adult literacy, Israel scores 8.89. This isn’t just the second-highest score in the category, it’s surpassed by one country only, Norway, and equaled just by Iceland and New Zealand. In political participation, Israel is in the global top four.

### Violation – Ukraine

#### Violation - Ukraine has free and fair elections

Freedom House 18 (https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/ukraine)

ELECTORAL PROCESS: 9 / 12 A1. Was the current head of government or other chief national authority elected through free and fair elections? 4 / 4 The president is elected to a maximum of two five-year terms. After Yanukovych fled the country in February 2014, a snap presidential election was held that May. Poroshenko won 54.7 percent of the overall vote and majorities in regions across the country. International observers deemed the vote competitive and credible, although polling could not take place in Crimea and separatist-held parts of Donbas. A2. Were the current national legislative representatives elected through free and fair elections? 3 / 4 Early parliamentary elections held in October 2014 were generally deemed competitive and credible, but voting was again impossible in Crimea and separatist-held parts of Donbas. Consequently, the elections filled only 423 of the parliament’s 450 seats. Petro Poroshenko’s Bloc won 133 seats, former prime minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk’s People’s Front took 81, Self-Reliance 33, the Opposition Bloc 29, the Radical Party 22, and Fatherland 19. Several smaller parties and 96 independents divided the remainder.

#### Yes political opposition

Melinda Haring (Melinda Haring is the editor of the UkraineAlert blog at the Atlantic Council and a fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute. She tweets @melindaharing), 12-11-2018, "Ukraine’s Maidan Opposition Is Finally Getting Organized, but Will It Make Any Difference?," Atlantic Council, https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/ukrainealert/ukraine-s-maidan-opposition-is-finally-getting-organized-but-will-it-make-any-difference WJ

On December 7, about two hundred fifty Ukrainians gathered in Kyiv for the launch of a new social movement that looks set to become Ukraine’s first liberal political party.

People Matter is basing its platform on minimizing the role of government in the economy and reorienting the entire state around the concept of service; in American terms, it would be considered center right or libertarian. The movement is led by five prominent reformers with experience in and out of government: Kyiv entrepreneur and city councilman Sergiy Gusovsky; ProZorro founder and first deputy minister at the Economic Development and Trade Ministry Max Nefyodov; think tank executive Victor Andrusiv; open government expert Oleksiy Honcharuk; and NGO leader Oksana Nechyporenko. Its working slogan, “People Matter,” encompasses the vision for the movement, says Gusovsky, who thinks reforming the state comes down to having the right people in the right place at the right time.

At the end of the three-hour discussion, attendees were asked to give their time and money. The movement will be funded by small and medium-sized donations from ordinary people and businesses, Gusovsky said.

Of course, it all sounds splendid, but Ukraine already has more than 120 active political parties, and for the last months, reformers have done little besides trying to organize a unified political movement to contest the 2019 presidential election.

### Violation – Latin America CN

#### Violation – the aff references Colombia and Peru and neither are authoritarian – no plan text in a vacuum because they clearly only get offense off Colombia

## T – Regime

### 1NC – MbS

#### Interp – A regime is a set of clear set of understandings governing political participation

Gasiorowski 96 MARK J. GASIOROWSKI, Political scientist at Tulane University in New Orleans in the field of Middle East politics, Third World politics, and U.S. foreign policy, 8-1-1996, “An Overview of the Political Regime Change Dataset”, [https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414096029004004 /](https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414096029004004%20/) MM

A political regime is a set of rules, procedures, and understandings governing political participation (Macridis, 1986, p. 2). The literature on political regimes focus on two main types of regimes: democracy and authoritarianism.

#### Violation – the aff defends MbS, he’s a crown prince, not a set of norms

#### Vote neg –

#### Limits – allows them to shift out of any neg disad the second MbS is out of office, that makes stable links impossible and no lit is wrote for specific conditions or leaders, if anything it’s neg ground

#### Semantics - prefer semantical accuracy for the resolution – it’s the only way to define a stable stasis point for engagement and prevents arbitrarily throwing words in the resolution

### 1NC – Turks

#### Regime is an institution with geographical limits, bound by explicit rules, and agreed on by governments.

Ward 19 (Enclopaedia Britannica Political Science, “Regime”, accessed 4/27/19. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/regime>) PT

Regime, an institution with clear substantive and geographical limits, bound by explicit rules, and agreed on by governments. The concept of regime is often preceded by a spatial adjective—international, national, or urban, for example—that refers to the area over which it has jurisdiction and can be used to refer to all manner of substantive remits over which it has control—development, environment, labour, trade, and so on. A more-detailed definition documents the means through which an institution forms. The emphasis is on the principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which the expectations of individual actors (normally governments) converge and are institutionalized.

#### The Kurds are not a government institution, they’re an ethnic group

Editors of Britannica 19 (Encyclopaedia Britannica, People, “Kurd”, accessed 4/27/19, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Kurd#ref284087>) PT

Kurd, member of an ethnic and linguistic group living in the Taurus Mountains of eastern Anatolia, the Zagros Mountains of western Iran, portions of northern Iraq, Syria, and Armenia, and other adjacent areas. Most of the Kurds live in contiguous areas of Iran, Iraq, and Turkey—a somewhat loosely defined geographic region generally referred to as Kurdistan (“Land of the Kurds”). The name has different connotations in Iran and Iraq, which officially recognize internal entities by this name: Iran’s northwestern province of Kordestān and Iraq’s Kurdish autonomous region. A sizable noncontiguous Kurdish population also exists in the Khorāsān region, situated in Iran’s northeast.

#### Vote neg---

#### Limits---they open up an already massive topic to any group the US gives money or guns to, which explodes neg research burdens and decks clash

#### Ground---all disad links and counterplan competition in the literature is predicated upon countries

## T – Military Aid

### 1NC - General

#### Interp – Military aid is aid direct towards benefiting armed forces

USAID no date <https://explorer.usaid.gov/about.html#tab-methodology> / MM

Military assistance is defined as foreign aid for programs primarily for the benefit of recipient government armed forces, or aid which subsidizes or substantially enhances military capability. Military assistance excludes humanitarian and non-military development programs funded by the U.S. Department of Defense; these programs are categorized as 'Economic Assistance'.

#### Violation – the aff defends <>

#### Vote neg:

#### Limits – Drawing a stable definition is the only way to provide a clear brightline for what kind of aid is topical. Otherwise the aff can spec any subset of military aid which explodes the negative prep burden and draws irreciprocal lines.

#### Topic Ed – our list answers the best questions of the resolution**, the USAID is a federal agency and has an intent-to-define, any other definition is self-serving, arbitrary, and doesn’t answer what the resolution intends**

#### At best they’re extra T – voting issue since it requires the neg to read T or a CP just to get back to ground zero which causes 2NR meltdown

Competing interps because reasonability necessitates judge intervention and creates a race to the bottom.

No RVI because they don’t get a cookie for proving they aren’t abusive

### 1NC – Counternarcotics

#### Interp - Military aid is bilateral military loans and grants – counternarcotics isn’t T

Sullivan et al 11 - Patricia L. Sullivan (UGA), Brock F. Tessman (UGA), Xiaojun Li (Stanford), “US Military Aid and Recipient State Cooperation”, *Foreign Policy Analysis* (2011) 7, 275–294 WJ

We define military aid as ‘‘total bilateral military assistance loans and grants’’ as reported by USAID through its Overseas Loans and Grants (Greenbook). The ‘‘Greenbook’’ measure of military assistance includes aid for several programs, including International Military Education and Training, Military Assistance Program Grants, Foreign Military Credit Financing, and Transfers of Excess Defense Articles.4 The measure excludes military assistance that is given for economic development purposes (which is captured in a separate measure of economic aid) and assistance given for counternarcotics and counterproliferation efforts, as well commercial military sales (USAID).5 We use the natural log of total US military aid delivered to a country in constant 2002 US dollars in our models. We also create a variable (milaiddep) that measures the relative dependence of the recipient country on US military aid. This variable is generated by dividing the amount of military aid by the GDP of the recipient country.6

#### Violation: counternarcotics is security assistance

Bearak 16 (Max Bearak, ) ["Everything you ever wanted to know about the U.S. foreign assistance budget," Washington Post, 10-18-2016, https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/world/which-countries-get-the-most-foreign-aid/] whs-ee recut

In the breakdown above, we have laid out where the $42.4 billion will go in 2017. The money comes from the State and Defense departments and a slew of other agencies. But it would be wrong to think that “security assistance” comes entirely from the DoD. Security assistance is a broader term than so-called military aid because this financial support is often extended to other types of security forces such as anti-narcotic or trafficking units.

#### Counternartoctics are “non-military security assistance

McBride 18 James McBride, 10-1-2018, [covers economics, energy policy, and European politics. He received a bachelor’s degree from St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota, and a master’s degree from Georgetown University’s Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service.] "How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?," Council on Foreign Relations, https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid

Military and security aid (33 percent) primarily goes toward helping allies purchase U.S. military equipment, training foreign military personnel, and funding peacekeeping missions. A smaller slice goes to “non-military security assistance,” which includes counternarcotics programs in Afghanistan, Colombia, Peru, and elsewhere, as well as nonproliferation and counterterrorism efforts.

#### Vote neg -

#### Limits – their model justifies anything from troops to humanitarian aid and security assistance to general money used for military purposes – only this definition creates a reasonable caselist for aid – also wrecks predictability and makes prep impossible since they can spec their way out of generic links to financing

#### Topic lit – our definition has intent to define and proves most authors writing about aid write in the context of things like financing and training rather than counternarcotic ops. Key to getting to the core controversy of the topic instead of getting to the margins where it’s skewed.

### 1NC – Ukraine

#### Interp - Military aid is offensive military capabilities

ICIJ 7 - The Int'l Consortium of Investigative Journalists, “A citizen’s guide to understanding U.S. foreign military aid,” <http://www.publicintegrity.org/2007/05/22/5772/citizen-s-guide-understanding-us-foreign-military-aid> WJ

For the “Collateral Damage” investigative study, the Center for Public Integrity created a database that tracks a subset of those financial flows: taxpayer-funded programs or assistance that contribute to a nation’s offensive military capabilities. The database does not include certain large nuclear non-proliferation programs or expenditures such as Foreign Military Sales or Direct Commercial Sales, which are not supported directly with taxpayer dollars. The database is also limited to tracking funds appropriated to either the Defense Department or the State Department. For this report, these are the criteria for “foreign military assistance” or “foreign military aid.”

#### Violation – their uniqueness evidences says “$200m in defense funds” – no plan text in a vacuum because their aff obviously defends ending that aid

#### Vote neg -

#### Limits – they get access to benefit off of communications, night vision, SITCOM, medical treatment, missile shields, etc. Most of our aid is defensive so they increase the topic multiple times over.

#### Semantics - Even if they’re a better version of the topic, the only predictable basis for pre-round prep is the meaning of the res, they justify a different topic not this one.

### 1NC – Harrison Police

#### Interp: Aid is money in the form of gifts, grants, or loans from one country to another

Kenton 18 [Will; writer and editor for digital publications, Former managing editor of Kapitall Wire, Editor in Chief and lead contributor to Cultural Capitol, freelance writer and editor for Time Inc., Rizzoli International Publications, The Rockefeller Foundation, The Awl; Investopedia; 3/20/18; “Foreign Aid”; <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/f/foreign-aid.asp>] / MM

Foreign aid is money that one country voluntarily transfers to another, which can take the form of a gift, a grant or a loan. In the United States, the term usually refers only to military and economic assistance the federal government provides to other governments. Broader definitions of aid include money transferred across borders by religious organizations, nongovernment organizations (NGOs) and foundations. Some have argued that remissions should be included, but they are rarely assumed to constitute aid.

#### Violation – the aff defends US cutting military aid to police departments, only national governments are T

#### Vote neg for predictable limits – not a single piece of evidence in the 1AC says the words “military aid”, their interp would justify affs like natural disasters, counternarcotics, or drone basing being topical which is ridiculous. Drawing a stable line on what country or kind of aid is topical is key to well-prepared opponents to contest their aff.

#### Evaluate debate through competing interps – reasonability creates a race to the bottom and encourages judge intervention

#### Impact turns aren’t a voting issue and no weighing case

#### Perfcon – if T’s bad and you vote for them on that arg, you’re voting on T.

#### Substance – if T’s bad then we should try debating on substance – impact turns force me to go for T since I need to defend my position.

#### Dead end – strategy guides debates so they’ll desire that people read T to beat them on the impact turn – that proves their strategy is reactive and can’t solve since they rely on the structures they critique.

### Violation – Counternarcotics

#### Military aid is bilateral military loans and grants – counternarcotics isn’t T

Sullivan et al 11 - Patricia L. Sullivan (UGA), Brock F. Tessman (UGA), Xiaojun Li (Stanford), “US Military Aid and Recipient State Cooperation”, *Foreign Policy Analysis* (2011) 7, 275–294 WJ

We define military aid as ‘‘total bilateral military assistance loans and grants’’ as reported by USAID through its Overseas Loans and Grants (Greenbook). The ‘‘Greenbook’’ measure of military assistance includes aid for several programs, including International Military Education and Training, Military Assistance Program Grants, Foreign Military Credit Financing, and Transfers of Excess Defense Articles.4 The measure excludes military assistance that is given for economic development purposes (which is captured in a separate measure of economic aid) and assistance given for counternarcotics and counterproliferation efforts, as well commercial military sales (USAID).5 We use the natural log of total US military aid delivered to a country in constant 2002 US dollars in our models. We also create a variable (milaiddep) that measures the relative dependence of the recipient country on US military aid. This variable is generated by dividing the amount of military aid by the GDP of the recipient country.6

#### Violation: they defend counternarcotics which is security assistance

Bearak 16 (Max Bearak, ) ["Everything you ever wanted to know about the U.S. foreign assistance budget," Washington Post, 10-18-2016, https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/world/which-countries-get-the-most-foreign-aid/] whs-ee

In the breakdown above, we have laid out where the $42.4 billion will go in 2017. The money comes from the State and Defense departments and a slew of other agencies. But it would be wrong to think that “security assistance” comes entirely from the DoD. Security assistance is a broader term than so-called military aid because this financial support is often extended to other types of security forces such as anti-narcotic or trafficking units.

#### Counternartoctics are “non-military security assistance

James McBride, 10-1-2018, [covers economics, energy policy, and European politics. He received a bachelor’s degree from St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota, and a master’s degree from Georgetown University’s Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service.] "How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?," Council on Foreign Relations, https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid

Military and security aid (33 percent) primarily goes toward helping allies purchase U.S. military equipment, training foreign military personnel, and funding peacekeeping missions. A smaller slice goes to “non-military security assistance,” which includes counternarcotics programs in Afghanistan, Colombia, Peru, and elsewhere, as well as nonproliferation and counterterrorism efforts.

### Definitions

#### Interp: Aid is money in the form of gifts, grants, or loans from one country to another

Kenton 18 [Will; writer and editor for digital publications, Former managing editor of Kapitall Wire, Editor in Chief and lead contributor to Cultural Capitol, freelance writer and editor for Time Inc., Rizzoli International Publications, The Rockefeller Foundation, The Awl; Investopedia; 3/20/18; “Foreign Aid”; <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/f/foreign-aid.asp>] / MM

Foreign aid is money that one country voluntarily transfers to another, which can take the form of a gift, a grant or a loan. In the United States, the term usually refers only to military and economic assistance the federal government provides to other governments. Broader definitions of aid include money transferred across borders by religious organizations, nongovernment organizations (NGOs) and foundations. Some have argued that remissions should be included, but they are rarely assumed to constitute aid.

## T – Arms Sales

#### Interpretation – military aid is bilateral military loans and grants – arms sales aren’t T

Sullivan et al 11 - Patricia L. Sullivan (UGA), Brock F. Tessman (UGA), Xiaojun Li (Stanford), “US Military Aid and Recipient State Cooperation”, *Foreign Policy Analysis* (2011) 7, 275–294 WJ

We define military aid as ‘‘total bilateral military assistance loans and grants’’ as reported by USAID through its Overseas Loans and Grants (Greenbook). The ‘‘Greenbook’’ measure of military assistance includes aid for several programs, including International Military Education and Training, Military Assistance Program Grants, Foreign Military Credit Financing, and Transfers of Excess Defense Articles.4 The measure excludes military assistance that is given for economic development purposes (which is captured in a separate measure of economic aid) and assistance given for counternarcotics and counterproliferation efforts, as well commercial military sales (USAID).5 We use the natural log of total US military aid delivered to a country in constant 2002 US dollars in our models. We also create a variable (milaiddep) that measures the relative dependence of the recipient country on US military aid. This variable is generated by dividing the amount of military aid by the GDP of the recipient country.6

#### Must be financially concessionary

Brozska 4 Michael Brzoska, director of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy and a professor at the University of Hamburg, Germany. 2004. “The economics of arms imports after the end of the cold war”. *Defence and Peace Economics*, 15:2, 111-123. DOI: 10.1080/1024269032000110496

Following the usual definition of overseas development assistance (ODA), only those transfers that are concessional in financial terms (if a loan, carry a grant element) are considered. In analogy to the official ODA definition (OECD, 1992) one could define military aid understood this way as flows of goods, services and capital undertaken by the official sector, with promotion of foreign military capabilities as the main objectives, at concessional terms.

#### Violation – they defend arms sales, all their offense is contingent on selling arms

#### Vote neg for Limits – their model justifies anything from troops to humanitarian aid to general money used for military purposes – the US maintains arms deals with loads of nations and allowing affs to defend arms sales explodes the topic to every regime that manages to get its hands-on US weaponry

#### At best they’re extra T – voting issue since it requires the neg to read T or a CP just to get back to ground zero which causes 2NR meltdown

#### Use competing interps because you can’t be reasonably topical and reasonability creates a race to the bottom

## T – Must Spec Country

#### Interpretation– the affirmative has to specify the countries they remove aid from, to clarify, you can’t say Latin America, you have to say every country explicitly in the plan text

#### Violation –

#### Vote neg for skew- they moot 1nc prep since I never know what countries I can read DAs to which prevents my ability to engage effectively - they get to fiat out of alt causes but don’t give me the ability to contest those countries – it encourages 1AR restarts and reading new impacts to countries that the 1AC didn’t talk about

#### Failure to specify causes circumvention – vote neg on presumption

Meyer 88 (Jeffrey A. Meyer, J.D. candidate, Yale Law School. Congressional Control of Foreign Assistance, 13 Yale J. Int'l L. (1988). Available at: <http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/yjil/vol13/iss1/5>, JKS)

The early foreign aid restrictions gave wide powers to the President to avoid their application and left Congress with few tools to control executive action. Only scattered reporting requirements and the threat of a concurrent resolution legislative veto constrained executive action. 16 Meanwhile, the President had broad discretionary power to waive prohibitions, to avoid applying restrictions because of vague definitional limits, and to invoke independent authorities to spend and re-direct foreign assistance for purposes unauthorized by Congress. Almost all of the early restrictions on foreign assistance allowed the President an unlimited power of waiver. Typically, the President could make a finding that a restriction did not serve "national security interests" and waive it without informing Congress or explaining his rationale.17 Where Congress did not allow a waiver, the President could still evade the effect of congressional restrictions because of their definitional vagueness.18 The President was not required to consult with Congress or refer to any objective standard in complying with such definitional limits.

#### CX is insufficient- it doesn’t preserve preround prep, judges don’t flow even if they think its binding, people waste my time by giving dodgy answers, and it doesn’t establish textual competition for counterplans

## T – Aid Spec

### 1NC – General

#### Interpretation: the aff must defend getting rid of all military aid to at least one country.

#### The resolution is a generic statement without qualifiers, affirming requires defending all instances of military aid

Byrd no date [“Generic Meaning,” Georgia State University, Transcript of lecture given by Pat Byrd, Department of Applied Linguistics & ESL]

Here are some things that we do know about these generic noun phrase types when they are used in context:1. The + singular: The computer has changed modern life. This form is considered more formal than the others--and is not as likely to be used in conversation as the plural noun: Computers have changed modern life. Master (1987) found in the sample that he analyzed that this form with the was often used to introduce at topic--and came at the beginning of a paragraph and in introductions and conclusions.2. **Zero + plural:** Computers are machines. Computers have changed modern life. Probably the most common form for a generalization. It can be used in all contexts--including both conversation (Basketball players make too much money) and academic writing (Organisms as diverse as humans and squid share many biological processes). Perhaps used more in the hard sciences and social sciences than in the humanities. 3. A + singular: A computer is a machine. This generic structure is used to refer to individual instances of a whole group and is used to classify whatever is being discussed.The form is often used for definitions of terms. It is also often used to explain occupations. My sister is a newspaper reporter. I am a teacher. Use is limited to these "classifying" contexts. Notice that this form can't always be subtituted for the other: \*Life has been changed by a computer. \*A computer has changed modern life. 4. Zero + noncount: Life has been changed by the computer. The most basic meaning and use of noncount nouns is generic--they are fundamentally about a very abstract level of meaning. Thus, the most common use of noncount nouns is this use with no article for generic meaning.Zero Article and Generic Meaning: Most nouns without articles have generic meaning. Two types are involved.1. Zero + plural: Computers are machines. Computers have changed modern life.2. Zero + noncount: Life has been changed by the computer.

#### Violation –

#### Standards:

#### Limits: there are tons of different types of military aid you can specify from specific weapons, to different programs, to specific monetary conditions, which overstretches the neg research burden.

#### Ground: allows you to cherrypick specific instances where aid is bad which prevents effective cost benefit analysis and pigeonholes the neg into extremist generics. The neg has nothing to say vs. the “end aid used to kill dissidents” which is functionally a conditions cp that should be neg ground and unbalances the topic.

## T – Nebel

### 1NC - Long

#### Interp – The affirmative must defend that the US ought not provide aid to all authoritarian regimes AND the negative can’t read PICs or disads out of single countries

Nebel 19 Nebel, Jake. [PhD candidate in philosophy at New York University, executive director at the Victory Briefs Institute for Debate, professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California]. “Existential Bare Plurals and Quantifier Scope.” Vbriefly. January 2, 2019. <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/01/02/existential-bare-plurals-and-quantifier-scope-by-jake-nebel/?fbclid=IwAR3d1BVzSwoB1sq7PQR9dYE3_Ee-qAgD-phE2xJh6kAmrrgPOyabpO_Dxww>

Let’s start with [some](https://www.vbriefly.com/2014/12/19/jake-nebel-on-specifying-just-governments/) [background](https://www.vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/). “Authoritarian regimes” is a [bare plural](http://www.glottopedia.org/index.php/Bare_plural): it’s a plural noun phrase without an explicit [determiner](http://www.glottopedia.org/index.php/Determiner) (e.g., “five,” “some,” “all,” “the,” “most”). Bare plurals are typically used to express [generic generalizations](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/), as in “Ravens are black.” Unlike [universally quantified statements](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universal_quantification), generics tolerate exceptions. For example, “Ravens are black” is true even though “All ravens are black” is false. In addition to generic readings, bare plurals can also sometimes have [existential](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Existential_quantification) readings, as if they were preceded by “some.” For example, “Ravens are outside” is true just in case there are some ravens—i.e., more than one—outside. Unlike existential statements, generic generalizations are not entailed by specific instances. For example, the generic “Ravens are white” is false even though some ravens are indeed white; white ravens are white not because they are ravens but because they have leucism. For reasons I’ve given elsewhere, and which apply straightforwardly to this topic, I think “authoritarian regimes” is a generic bare plural, not an existential one. My reasons include (i) that it fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential bare plurals (the resolution doesn’t entail that the United States ought not provide military aid to governments, even though all authoritarian regimes are governments); (ii) that bare plurals [denote kinds](http://idiom.ucsd.edu/~ivano/SemBabble_old/LogicSeminar_15W/Material/Carlson_1977_EnglishBarePlurals.pdf) of things, not specific members of those kinds, and so get an existential reading only in very specific circumstances which don’t seem to obtain in this resolution; (iii) that generics are our [default means of generalization](https://journals.openedition.org/rlv/2048#abstract), especially in [moral contexts](https://www.princeton.edu/leslie/Lerner_et_al-2013-Philosophical_Perspectives.pdf), so we should expect the resolution to be generic absent strong evidence to the contrary; and, most importantly, (iv) that we can simply tell that it’s generic by [linguistic intuition](https://academic.oup.com/bjps/article/61/1/123/1451363), which is the primary source of data for linguistic theorizing. The generic interpretation implies that many affirmative advocacies—those that specify particular authoritarian regimes to which the United States ought not provide military aid, leaving open the possibility of providing aid to all other authoritarian regimes—do not affirm the resolution, because generic generalizations are not entailed by specific instances.[1](https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/01/02/existential-bare-plurals-and-quantifier-scope-by-jake-nebel/?fbclid=IwAR3d1BVzSwoB1sq7PQR9dYE3_Ee-qAgD-phE2xJh6kAmrrgPOyabpO_Dxww#fn1) To affirm the resolution, regime-specific affirmatives require an existential interpretation of “authoritarian regimes,” which is incorrect. In this article, however, I want to suppose for the sake of argument that the existential interpretation is correct, and argue that regime-specific affirmatives—even those that specify more than one regime—still violate the existential interpretation. In the course of laying out the argument, we’ll learn about an idea of crucial importance to both philosophy and linguistics—the concept of [quantifier scope](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scope_%28logic%29)—and, rather than finish my dissertation, I’d like to introduce debaters to that idea.

#### Violation – the aff defends <>

#### Vote neg:

#### Limits – You can pick any of over 50 authoritarian regimes and there’s no universal DA since each regime has a different political situation. Incentivizes obscure affs that negs won’t have prep on which wrecks engagement.

#### Ground – You can the pick the most desirable offense where aff ground is biased and moots out of core neg offense like fill in or terror. That outweighs – the neg needs core args to test specific affs which your interp makes impossible.

#### Grammar - prefer semantical accuracy for the resolution – it’s the only way to define a stable stasis point for engagement and prevents arbitrarily throwing words in the resolution

#### **TVA – read the aff as an advantage under a whole res aff, we get full strength of link to disads and you get the education and ground of your aff**

Use competing interps because reasonability necessitates judge intervention and creates a race to the bottom.

No RVI because they don’t get a cookie for proving they aren’t abusive

### 1NC - Short

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend ending military aid to more than one regime.

#### Regimes is the plural of regime

Merriam Webster RE

plural regimes

#### Plural means:

Merriam Webster RE

 relating to, consisting of, or containing more than one or more than one kind or class

#### Vote neg - they justify the aff arbitrarily doing away with words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation. It’s not just a question of them being able to ignore the plural aspect of the resolution, but if they are allowed to ignore the definitions of certain terms of the resolution what stops them from reading an aff about humanitarian aid and avoiding the military part of the resolution—their norm is one where the aff can decide to do away with parts of the resolution at their whim which outweighs their offense on magnitude.

#### Use competing interps since you can’t be reasonably topical and reasonability necessitates judge intervention.

## T – Regime & Aid Spec

#### Interpretation: the aff may only specify either countries or a type of military aid, but not both.

#### Violation:

#### Vote neg for limits – they allow WAY too many affs and steal neg ground – it lets you provide certain kinds of aid for specific countries which should be neg ground, that’s key to having clashing debates and prepared opponents. It allows any permutation of tiny affs like Cameroon or Qatar that moot core neg disads. Our interp solves their ground or aff flex offense because we get country or aid disads but doesn’t overlimit

## T – Prohibit

### 1NC – General

#### A. Interpretation and violation: the affirmative must defend entirely withholding the specified aid – to clarify, they cannot condition aid

#### “Ought not” in the resolution means prohibition

Scheffler 92, Samuel, Human Morality, [https://sci-hub.tw/https://www.jstor.org/stable/2940972 /](https://sci-hub.tw/https%3A//www.jstor.org/stable/2940972%20/) MM

First some terminological matters. I will call the judgment that a particular act is morally required, permissible, or prohibited an overall moral verdict about that act. I will treat judgments about what agents ought to do, or about what it would be right for them to do, as equivalent to judgments about what they are morally required to do. And I will treat judgments about what agents ought not to do, or about what it would be wrong for them to do, as equivalent to judgments about what they are morally prohibited from doing. Finally, it will be helpful to distinguish between a narrow use and a broad use of the term ‘moral consideration’. Used narrowly, it may refer to any consideration that is cast in what would ordinarily be regarded as explicitly or overtly moral terms. In this usage, moral considerations include verdictive considerations about what one ought or ought not to do, about what is morally required or forbidden, and so on, as well as more specific evidential considerations, such as considerations of rights, fairness, equality, and the like, which support but do not constitute overall moral verdicts.1 Used broadly, the term ‘moral consideration’ may refer either to a verdictive consideration or to any consideration that supports an overall moral verdict, whether or not the supporting consideration is formulated in explicitly moral terms. Consider, for example, the rescue case discussed in the previous chapter. If we suppose that it is permissible for the man to save his wife precisely because she is his wife, then the consideration that she is his wife counts as a moral consideration in the broad but not in the narrow usage. For our present purposes, the important thing to note is that, in raising the question of how moral considerations arc to be conceived of as impinging on agents’ deliberations, it is the role of overtly moral considerations—moral considerations narrowly understood—that we are inquiring about. For it is primarily the possibility of assigning too large a role to those considerations that generates the threat of an overly moralized conception of deliberation. With these remarks as background, let me now distinguish among five different ways in which overtly moral considerations may impinge on an agent’s deliberations about what to do.2 (30)

#### Vote neg -

#### Limits – doubles the affs on the topic – they can either abolish aid or condition it which makes stable CP competition impossible and disad links unstable because all our links are contingent on complete withdrawal, at worst they’re extra T voting issue since it requires the neg to read T or a CP just to get back to ground zero which causes 2NR meltdown

#### Grammar – prefer semantical accuracy for the resolution – it’s the only way to define a stable stasis point for engagement and prevents arbitrarily throwing words in the resolution

### Violation – Honduras

#### Violation – their solvency advocate says that we “suspend funds”, suspend is defined by Merriam Webster as “**to stop temporarily”**

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/suspend>

## T – Extra

### 1NC – General

#### Interpretation – the affirmative may only fiat a withdrawal of military aid, to clarify, you can’t defend extra actions on top of not withdrawing military aid

#### Violation – the aff defends using the money to do community building

#### Vote neg for skew – it allows the aff to get away with defending infinite actions on top of the plan, the neg has to read T or a CP just to get back to ground zero which causes 2NR meltdown and kills stable links, anything that’s beyond the resolution steals negative ground. The first two advantages would be a perf con with the third advantage if it weren’t for the extra plank. Their third advantage says that domestic criticism of foreign conflicts is wasted energy and that energy should be fueled towards solving conflicts at home. Perf cons are an independent voter – it allows the aff to shift and moot 1NC links.

## T – Implementation

### 1NC – Procedural

#### Interpretation – affs must defend implementation of a post-fiat action where the United States stops providing military aid to authoritarian regimes

#### Violation –

#### Vote neg for stable link ground – all neg disads are based around the US keeping aid or what would happen if the US removed aid from regimes, they can’t shift out of all neg disads by saying it’s contingent on implementation – that only leaves the neg with phil debate and theory which is worse than topic specific education and significantly skews the debate towards whichever side has access to more phil ground instead of open engagement

Use competing interps because reasonability necessitates judge intervention and creates a race to the bottom.

No RVI because they don’t get a cookie for proving they aren’t abusive and it discourages reading theory against dumb affs

## Graphs/Images

#### **Interpretation – Debaters cannot have images in the substantive offense sections of their speech doc.**

#### **Violation –**

#### **Vote aff–**

#### **Time skew—you get substantive offense that you don’t read aloud, this means that while I have 13 mins of substantive offense you get 13 PLUS additional offense rom the images.**

#### **Judge intervention—you make the judge determine how much of the graph to buy and how much to not buy without making arguments describing or defending the graph. This leaves debate up to a subjective value judgment -outweighs because the judge’s obligation is to evaluate the round in an unbiased way.**

#### **Voters –**

#### **Fairness is a voter – gateway issue, most constitutive**

#### **Drop the debater**

#### **Competing interps**

#### **No rvis**