# **Aff**

## **1AR Theory – Generic**

### **Reasonability on Multiple Shells [35 s]**

1. Interpretation: If the negative debater reads more than one shell with pre-fiat theoretical implications in the 1NC/1NR, they must endorse a paradigm of reasonability on all neg interps. To clarify, reasonability means that if I win defense under a counterinterp, it’s sufficient.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
4. Strat skew – 7-4-6-3 time skew means they can outspread me with multiple shells and go for the one I undercover. I don’t have time to generate sufficient offense to multiple offensive neg shells, which means reasonability compensates. Also, RVIs don’t solve; even if I win one shell, they can do rigorous 2NR weighing for the shell I undercover and moot my theory offense. Key to fairness since strategies win the ballot. Internal link to clash since there’s no engagement if they just go for undercovered arguments.
5. Substantive education– Reasonability ensures a faster return to substance by minimizing the theory debate; o/w education from theory because it’s portable to the real world.
6. Voters:

*XA; Fairness/education (if not read already)*

Drop the neg debater and evaluate under competing interps: a) I had to waste time checking the abuse, which skews my 1AR strat and b) Allowing them to quickly beat back 1AR theory with flimsy defense returns the round to the skewed layer and magnifies their time advantage on the theory debate.

### **Must Weigh Voters [30 s]**

1. Interpretation: If the negative debater advances multiple theoretical voting issues in the 1NC/1NR, they must explicitly rank the importance of each voter in their first speech.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
4. Strat skew – 7-4-6-3 time skew means either a) I put blippy offense on every voter in the 1AR, in which case they can easily beat back my arguments in 6 minutes or b) I do weighing and go for one voter, in which case they’ll do a dump of 2NR weighing and win the voters I didn’t cover. Key to fairness since strategies win the ballot.
5. Clash *(only read if education is voter)* – If they just go for undercovered 1AR arguments, they never have to engage with their substance. Strongest link to education since we learn from how our arguments interact with each other.
6. Precedent – Debating about voters earlier in the round enables more in-depth deliberation about norms; independent voter because this round is irrevocably skewed, but our theory debate sets precedent for future rounds.
7. Voters:

*Fairness/education (if not read already)*

*Competing interps*

Drop the neg debater b/c I had to waste time checking the abuse, which skews my 1AR strategy

CX doesn’t check:

1. They should be held to text – a) CX answers can be misheard or intentionally deceptive, b) judges don’t flow CX
2. If it’s the aff’s burden to ask in CX, they’ll just hope people forget and they can still be abusive
3. Doesn’t solve pre-round prep from disclosure and prep during the 1NC. I form my 1AR strat before round and during the 1NC so if I wait until CX, I have to reformulate my strat completely during prep

### **Can’t Deny RVI [45 s]**

*Don’t read if you deny neg RVIs/2NR RVIs*

1. Interpretation: If a debater advocates theory or topicality, they **must only defend** a paradigm that necessitates the judge only vote for the debater w­ho a) wins that a violated interp/counter-interp of theirs is the better norm for debate and b) wins that the norm should operate at the highest level of the topicality or theory debate.

1. Violation: (**They read theory/topicality and denied an RVI**)
2. Standards:
3. Norm-setting – a) absent the interp, good theory debaters make poor arguments since each shell is no-risk and time trade-offs create a strategic advantage, b) deliberating over norms means the best ones prevail and determine future rounds; independent voter because debaters should bear responsibility for how they contribute to the community.
4. Critical education – a) forces debaters to reflect on the norms their advocacies produce and weigh the norms they endorse against competing paradigms for debate, which encourages comparison of net benefits, b) absent the interp, debate becomes static since we have no incentive to question its trends; independent voter because education is only possible under a paradigm that enables critical thinking.
5. Creativity – a) absent the interp, debaters will craft generic, agreeable strategies to avoid theory, b) the interp attaches a risk to running theory, so debaters will tailor theory to specific rounds rather than being generic, c) less frivolous theory gives creative positions more visibility since debaters have more time to explain them in rebuttals; key to education because it encourages exploring new concepts.

Voters:
*XA their voters; read education if they don’t*

*Competing interps*

Drop the neg debater b/c I had to waste time checking the abuse, which skews my 1AR strategy.

### **Must Spec CP Status [40 s]**

1. Interpretation: If the negative debater defends a counterplan, they must explicitly specify its status in the text of the 1NC. *To clarify, they must* *spec whether it’s conditional, dispositional, or unconditional.*
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
1) Strat skew – Either a) I answer the CP comprehensively, in which case they’ll just kick

out of it and moot my offense, or b) I allocate time elsewhere, in which case they’ll weigh and collapse to the CP. Forcing them to spec gives me insight into how I should prioritize different layers, which is key to fairness because it’s necessary for winnable strategies.
2) Clash – Absent specification, they’ll go for the most undercovered layer, which skirts

argument interaction. The interp avoids this because they’re held to the counterplan’s status early on and I can plan accordingly to generate sufficient offense on the correct layers, which enables in-depth debate. Strongest link to education since we learn from how our arguments interact with each other.

1. Voters:

*Fairness/education (if not read already)*

*Competing interps*

Drop the neg debater b/c I had to waste time checking the abuse, which skews my 1AR strategy

Prefer text to CX:

1. CX answers can be misheard or intentionally deceptive and judges don’t flow CX
2. They’ll waste my time skirting answers in CX
3. If it’s the aff’s burden to ask in CX, they’ll just hope people forget and they can still be abusive
4. Doesn’t solve pre-round prep from disclosure and prep during the 1NC. I form my 1AR strat before round and during the 1NC so if I wait until CX, I have to reformulate my strat completely during prep

### **Ks Must Be Policy [time this]**

1. Interpretation: If the negative debater reads a pre-fiat critique of the resolution or 1AC’s assumptions, the proposed negative alternative must either be implemented by or ascribable to a policy-making body.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
4. Advocacy skills – a) Real-world critiques aren’t persuasive unless they produce tangible change, and b) only poking holes in the opposition sacrifices pragmatic solutions for cynicism. Key to education because advocacy skills apply debate knowledge to the real world.

<card>

1. Ground – a) They can destroy my ground by claiming fiated solvency or adoption of a mindset moots the aff, and b) I lose key disadvantage and solvency deficit ground because they use vague alts to shift out, which o/w other ground given the shortness of links and exclusivity of alts. Key to fairness because argument access constrains the ballot.
2. Voters:

Fairness/education

Competing interps

Drop the neg debater b/c I had to waste time checking the abuse, which skews my 1AR strategy

### **Independent Voters Bad**

## **1AR Theory - Topical**

### **Spec N.S. in 1NC [40 s]**

1. Interpretation: The negative debater must explicitly state in the text of the 1NC whether they defend an absolute removal of national service or noncompulsory national service.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
4. Strat skew – National service currently exists so it’s ambiguous whether the neg defends status quo noncompulsory national service or an absolute removal. They can shift their stance in the 2NR according to my strategy. For example, if I claim national service is good, they’ll argue that there’s still national service in the neg world but if I claim only voluntary national service is bad, they’ll defend an absolute removal. Key to fairness since strategies win the ballot.
5. Clash *(only read if education is voter)* – If they can shift out of 1AR arguments, they never have to engage with the substance. Strongest link to education since we learn from how our arguments interact with each other.
6. Voters:

Fairness/education

Competing interps

Drop the neg debater b/c I had to waste time checking the abuse, which skews my 1AR strategy

CX doesn’t check:

1. They should be held to text – a) CX answers can be misheard or intentionally deceptive, b) judges don’t flow CX
2. If it’s the aff’s burden to ask in CX, they’ll just hope people forget and they can still be abusive
3. Doesn’t solve pre-round prep from disclosure and prep during the 1NC. I form my 1AR strat before round and during the 1NC so if I wait until CX, I have to reformulate my strat completely during prep

## **CI to Implementation**

1. Counter-interpretation: The affirmative may defend an advocacy without specific implementation of a policy that makes national service compulsory in the United States.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
4. Phil ed – a) Debating implementation mires us down in questions of solvency, which means debaters forego framework debate to argue the contention level; detracts from philosophical clash, b) implementation means only government actors and consequences matter, which excludes important intent-based, agent-specific moral theories like practical reason. Phil ed o/w other education because it’s specific to LD.
5. Textuality – **“**Ought to be” entails an ideal without an action or imperative:

**Robinson** (Richard Robinson, “Ought and Ought Not,” Philosophy, Vol. 46, No. 177 (Jul., 1971), pp. 193-202)

Many ought-sentences are not prescriptive at all, either prudentially or morally, but express valuations. Such as "Everybody ought to be happy". This is [are] not a prescriptionor command to anybody to act or to refrain. There is no possible act thatwould count as the fulfillment of the command, if it were a command. Neither individually nor collectively can we make everybody happy. But the state of universal happiness [it] is an ideal that we cherish; and the sentence expresses this ideal. It is thus a valuation. A valuation is somethingdistinct from a prescription, though they share the negative property of not being descriptions. Even when there is a possible act, the ought may be more ideal than prudential. The question "Do you think the hem of this dress ought to be higher?" suggests the practical possibility of raising the hem; but what the speaker has in mind is rather the question of beauty, of better- ness, of the ideal dress-length. "A clock ought to keep good time" is obviously not an imperative to clocks. Nor is it, except indirectly, a prescription to clockmakers and clockminders. It is a platitudinous restatement of the obvious ideal of a clock. (I take this example from Mellor's discussion of knowledge in Mind, 1967.) "You ought to feel ashamed" might be a moral ought if the speaker believed that we can feel what we will when we will; but usually it is the ideal ought. A man who feels shame after doing such an act is, in the speaker's opinion, a less bad man than one who does such an act and feels no shame. "Feel ashamed" does not refer to an action, a doing. Wherever ought is followed by a nondoing infinitive, as "to feel ashamed", it is likely to be the ideal ought. An outstanding case of the nondoing infinitive is "'to be"; and "ought to be" usually belongs to a sentence that expresses an ideal, not a command. "Everyone ought to be happy." "There ought to be a chicken in every pot." "Ought to have" is nearly the same. "Everyone ought to have a motor-car." "Everyone ought to have equal opportunity." "There ought to be a minimum wage" can perhaps be interpreted as a command to Parliament, and hence as the moral ought. Still more so the common phrase "There ought to be a law against it". But probably those who use such phrases rarely think of themselves as prescribing to Parliament; and what they say ought to exist is often something that cannot be brought into existence by the passage of a law. They are expressing an ideal.

This means the aff’s burden is only to defend the resolution as a general principle. Textuality is an independent voter: a) The resolution’s wording determines division of ground and guides pre-round prep, b) it regulates which forms of education are legitimate under the topic, and c) theoretical standards are meant to resolve textual interps, but if the interp isn’t textual in the first place, the theoretical standards are irrelevant.

1. Ground **–** a) Neg can strategically moot the AC since they have one-sided access to CPs, T, and PICs. Not defending policy action is key to stable aff offense and equalizing ground, b) Opens up neg ground because they don’t need pre-written evidence to contest implementation; instead, they can analytically answer the aff. Key to fairness b/c debaters need equal access to arguments
2. Voters: XA their voters
Education o/w:

Grant an RVI:

Affirm if I win a counterinterp, I-meet, or prove no abuse:

1. Neg can easily generate defense on theory and win substance in the 2NR whereas I have to spread out in the 1AR; irrespective of what the 2AR does, the neg can still split their time evenly and be at no disadvantage.
2. Aff speaks first which means neg is more likely to initiate a full theory shell with an implication. If there’s only an implication for the debater it’s read against, aff would disproportionately lose on theory

Textuality
1) The interp o/w ; “Ought to be” is a term of art, so they can’t just pick a single word and define it

## **CI to Must Spec Punishment**

Counterinterp: The affirmative debater does not have to specify punishment if there is a solvency advocate and the 1AC doesn’t defend implementation.

Standards:

1. Norm-setting: Slippery slope where debaters will just run T to infinitely spec things instead of engaging with the aff, which is bad for topic education
2. Phil ed: Most philosophical theories are only concerned with the act of compulsion and not the secondary outcomes from compulsion (give examples), which means talking about punishment strays away from debating b/t philosophies

T - Stable advocacy: Means I can just o/w on specificity to shift out of DAs

## **No 2NR RVIs**

1. Norm-setting – Incentivizes the neg to run abusive 1NC strats to goad 1AR theory so they can get an RVI in the 2NR and collapse on theory to outspread the 2AR.
2) Moots substantive discussion – The neg will collapse entirely to theory, and I can’t answer 6 minutes of theory *and* win substance in the 2AR, so I’m forced to only go for theory since it’s a higher layer.
3) Strat skew – 4-6-3 time skew allows them to do an RVI good dump, which I can’t sufficiently beat back while also winning theory or substance in the 2AR, which means the neg always wins.

## **1AR Theory = Drop Debater**

## **1AR Theory Frontlines**

# **1AC Underview – Generic**

1. The neg debater must check the exact wording of all T or theory interps in CX. Either a) I can change the abuse in CX which preserves substance and means I won’t skew your strat by reading an I-meet to moot T, or b) the abuse is so round-skewing that I can’t fix it and there’s literally no harm to the neg debater if they read it in CX because I can never possibly not abuse it.
2. Theory is ground to drop the neg but not the aff. I have to go all on in theory in the 3 minute 2AR but can’t on drop the argument, whereas neg gets 6 minute 2NR. Time skew key to fairness because equal time is key to equal access to ballot. Further, since the neg can generate defense on theory and easily win substance in the 2NR, if I win offense to a counter-interp, vote aff.
3. Theory on AC spikes are reasons to drop the argument: a) solves the abuse by allowing the negative to check bad spikes and exclude them from the debate, b) preserves substantive education - key to portable skills by stopping theory at a small part of the 1NC rather than consuming the debate.
4. The negative is responsive to the aff so they have a structural advantage in strategy framing and the aff has to make extensions twice while the neg only does it once. These disadvantages imply that the judge should a) presume aff because in the case of a tie I overcame more disadvantages and thus did the better debating, and b) any affirmative theoretical violations need to be weighed against the structural disadvantages of affirming in the 1N.
5. 1AR theory is justified and drop the debater: a) debatability –4 minutes isn’t enough time to run theory on abusive args and also answer those abusive args – this turns time skew and education args about engagement, b) argument quality – engaging in good theory debates means we actually discuss good norms – allowing the aff to do that is key, but letting the neg run frivolous theory destroys that.
6. Aff theory outweighs: a) Both their speeches are double my rebuttal so they can outspread me and b) I have to have a conception of the rules going into round since I enter blind – that makes debate possible – this means you presume there are no 2NR RVIs since the theory debate was skewed to begin with and they abused me in the NC – NR theory must win the RVI and then weigh it against aff disadvantages, c) neg has infinite flex so they can always pick a neg strat consistent with aff interpretations. This also means neg theory is drop the arg because the neg can always substantively engage the aff since they can choose a position based off my case.
7. Neg offense must be linked to a necessary and sufficient standard – necessary but insufficient burdens are bad: a) no way to weigh between multiple NIBs because they are all preclusive which makes the round irresolvable, b) structurally skews the aff by generating an unturnable position that can’t be offense for me; structural skews outweigh under fairness because you can always compensate for substantial skews but not structural ones, c) Skews strat by enabling the neg to be able to go for a single NIB to win the round which moots 6 minutes of AC offense that I can’t weigh.

# **Neg**

## No 1AR Theory

1. Bad clash – justifies uplayering and restarting the debate, which a) moots 7 minutes of neg arguments and b) generates a 7:6 minute time skew.
2. The initial 1AR shell won’t have extensive built-in framing and 2AR has special ability to weigh after I read the counterinterp. I can’t respond to 2AR weighing since there’s no 3NR, which means the aff can just restart the round with 1AR theory and win on 2AR re-contextualization every time.
3. Strat skew – 2AR can decide between going for theory or substance, which means the 2NR has to split time its time between both *and* preempt new 2AR weighing, which allows the aff to just explode the undercovered layer for 3 minutes.
4. Resolvability – The theory debate will be super undeveloped, so judges intervene on paradigm issues and vote arbitrarily because the later theory comes in the debate, the more controversial it is.
5. I can’t check abusive 1AR theory — a) judges are unreceptive to 2NR theory, and b) they can weigh 1AR theory against 2NR shells in the 2AR, which I can’t contest.

## No Aff RVIs

1. Strat skew – Allows the aff to collapse to theory for 3 minutes in the 2AR, which a) means they get strategic collapse/weighing, and b) I can’t formulate a 2NR strat because I don’t know whether they’ll go for theory heavily in the 2AR
2. Norm-setting – Incentivizes super abusive affs so they can prep out the most efficient counterinterp and win off the RVI

## **1NC Theory – Topical**

1. Interpretation: If the affirmative debater specifies that participation in **one** national service program is desirable under a system of Kantianism, that program must currently exist in the status quo as the 1AC defends it.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
4. Ground – I have no ground against the aff b/c I can’t read solvency indicts since Kantianism is intents-based and I can’t make arguments about why the Climate Conservation Corps is inconsistent with Kantianism because it doesn’t exist yet and you can construe it any way you want in the aff. Key to fairness b/c debaters need equal access to arguments.
5. Topic lit –
6. Voters:

Fairness/education

Competing interps

Drop the debater

No RVIs

1. The aff is bad; the public bears the cost of paying workers through taxes, but the individuals who aren’t working derive the marginal benefit.
2. Carbon tax is an instance of hindering a hindrance; his aff is not b/c it’s not stopping any violation of freedom
	1. There’s a difference between forcing people to actively help others and forcing people to hinder harm to people, so your aff violates Kantianism
	2. Kant says you cannot justifiably coerce someone who would object to the coercion on rational grounds. The NC is a reason why people would object to coercion on rational grounds. This is what Kant means by saying you can hinder a hindrance:

**Hodgson** (Hodgson, Louis-Philippe. *Kant on the Right to Freedom: A Defense.* Ethics2010. <http://www.yorku.ca/lhodgson/kant-on-the-right-to-freedo.pdf>)

The argument for the right to freedom travels more lightly. It does not entail that a person can be morally bound only by a law she imposes on herself but only that shecannot be justifiably coerced on grounds that she could object to and, hence, that she has a veto rightwith respect to the grounds that can be invoked to justify the use of force against her**.** This is undoubtedly a demanding conception of personal sovereignty, but it strikes me as having broader appeal than the deep Kantian conception of autonomy. All it assumes is that a rational agent is entitled to have force used against her only in ways that are justifiable from her point of view qua rational agent.

1. Weighing obligations under a Kantian framework is incoherent; if there is an obligation to do the aff and an obligation not to do the aff, that means the action is merely permissible. Permissibility negates:
	1. Textuality - Ought implies an active moral obligation to do something. Negating the resolution proves it false, meaning that the neg only has to prove either that there is an obligation not to do the aff **or** that there is no obligation to do the aff.

**Robinson** (Richard Robinson, “Ought and Ought Not,” *Philosophy*, 1971, Oriel College (Oxford))

*Ought and ought not are not contradictories.* **Given that it is false that you ought to***visit John***, it does not follow that you ought not to***visit John. Perhaps you are free to visit or not visit him, as you wish.* **And given that it is false that you ought not to***visit John***it does not follow that you ought to***visit him****.****It may be false both that you ought to visit him and that you ought not to visit him*. **Between the commanded and***the* **forbidden there is the permitted. The permitted is what we are neither commanded nor forbidden to do***, what we may or may not do,* *as we please****.****When ought and ought not are moral terms, may is also a moral term. Every act either ought to be done, or ought not to be done, or may be done. In logical terms, ought and ought not are contraries, not contradictories.* **"He ought to do it" and "He ought not to do it" cannot both be true, but they can both be false.**

* 1. Disproving that we ought to do something is consistent with permissibility, whereas proving that we ought to do something disproves the existence of permissions.

## **T**

### **Implementation**

1. Interpretation: The affirmative must defend the desirability of the U.S. government implementing a policy action that makes national service compulsory. To clarify, the affirmative may not \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

‘Resolved’ denotes a proposal to be formally enacted by law:

Words and Phrases 64 (Permanent Edition)Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

1. Violation: X
2. Standards:
3. Real-world education – Defending policy action is key to real-world advocacy skills and institutional decision-making.

Steinberg and Freeley (David, Lecturer in Communication studies and rhetoric. Advisor to Miami Urban Debate League. Director of Debate at U Miami, Former President of CEDA. And \*\* Austin, attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, JD, Suffolk University, *Argumentation and Debate***,** *Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*, 121-4; 2008) r
Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a tact or value or policy, there is no need for debate: the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four," because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification can!, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007.¶ Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job! They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference.¶ To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It's too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime'\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose.¶ Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does "effectiveness" mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

1. Debate over a topical stasis of controversy is key to facilitate clash and effective argumentation: a) Predictability – Aff gets infinite prep time and dictates the round, which means they need to abide by certain constraints or else there’s an infinite amount of affs they can defend. Disclosure doesn’t solve b/c you’re more prepped on your own strat than I am (which is especially true if your aff is uncommon), and it’s also a horrible norm to endorse if everyone is running drastically different affs even if they’re disclosed, since debaters won’t clash on the resolution’s core issues. Key to fairness because the better debater should win, not the one with the most arbitrary advocacy, b) Ground – If the aff doesn’t defend implementation, they can shift out of generic K links like cap and state bad, no-link disads, and moot solvency indicts and CPs, which are core neg ground; key to fairness b/c argument access constrains the ballot, c) Stable advocacy – Defending the res as a principle means they can re-contextualize their advocacy any way they desire in the 1 and 2AR to shift out of neg arguments, whereas if they defend implementation, I can hold them to the specificities of real government policies. Key to fairness b/c debaters need stable offense to win.
2. Switch-side debate – being forced to switch sides on a topic provides a more holistic understanding; anything less causes dogmatism and a lack of ability to engage from points of difference which severs education and makes us less effective advocates. Also *solves your offense*; you can read your aff on the neg.
3. Critical engagement – Maintaining hope in political praxis is crucial; structures of power will continue even if you refuse to engage them, which means tuning discussions towards policy is empowering and bolsters activism.

Coverstone (Alan Coverstone, longtime debate coach, “Acting on Activism: Realizing the Vision of Debate with Pro-social Impact,” paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Conference; Nov. 2005)

An important concern emerges when Mitchell describes reflexive fiat as a contest strategy capable of “eschewing the power to directly control external actors” (1998b, p. 20). Describing debates about what our government should do as attempts to control outside actors is debilitating and disempowering. Control of the US government is exactly what an active, participatory citizenry is supposed to be all about. After all, if democracy means anything, it means that citizens not only have the right, they also bear the obligation to discuss and debate what the government should be doing. Absent that discussion and debate, much of the motivation for personal political activism is also lost. Those who have co-opted Mitchell’s argument for individual advocacy often quickly respond that nothing we do in a debate round can actually change government policy, and unfortunately, an entire generation of debaters has now swallowed this assertion as an article of faith. The best most will muster is, “Of course not, but you don’t either!” The assertion that nothing we do in debate has any impact on government policy is one that carries the potential to undermine Mitchell’s entire project. If there is nothing we can do in a debate round to change government policy, then we are left with precious little in the way of pro-social options for addressing problems we face. At best, we can pursue some Pilot-like hand washing that can purify us as individuals through quixotic activism but offer little to society as a whole. It is very important to note that Mitchell (1998b) tries carefully to limit and bound his notion of reflexive fiat by maintaining that because it “views fiat as a concrete course of action, it is bounded by the limits of pragmatism” (p. 20). Pursued properly, the debates that Mitchell would like to see are those in which the relative efficacy of concrete political strategies for pro-social change is debated. In a few noteworthy examples, this approach has been employed successfully, and I must say that I have thoroughly enjoyed judging and coaching those debates. The students in my program have learned to stretch their understanding of their role in the political process because of the experience. Therefore, those who say I am opposed to Mitchell’s goals here should take care at such a blanket assertion. However, contest debate teaches students to combine personal experience with the language of political power. Powerful personal narratives unconnected to political power are regularly co-opted by those who do learn the language of power. One need look no further than the annual state of the Union Address where personal story after personal story is used to support the political agenda of those in power. The so-called role-playing that public policy contest debates encourage promotes active learning of the vocabulary and levers of power in America. Imagining the ability to use our own arguments to influence government action is one of the great virtues of academic debate. Gerald Graff (2003) analyzed the decline of argumentation in academic discourse and found a source of student antipathy to public argument in an interesting place. I’m up against…their aversion to the role of public spokesperson that formal writing presupposes. It’s as if such students can’t imagine any rewards for being a public actor or even imagining themselves in such a role. This lack of interest in the public sphere may in turn reflect a loss of confidence in the possibility that the arguments we make in public will have an effect on the world. Today’s students’ lack of faith in the power of persuasion reflects the waning of the ideal of civic participation that led educators for centuries to place rhetorical and argumentative training at the center of the school and college curriculum. (Graff, 2003, p. 57) The power to imagine public advocacy that actually makes a difference is one of the great virtues of the traditional notion of fiat that critics deride as mere simulation. Simulation of success in the public realm is far more empowering to students than completely abandoning all notions of personal power in the face of governmental hegemony by teaching students that “nothing they can do in a contest debate can ever make any difference in public policy.” Contest debating is well suited to rewarding public activism if it stops accepting as an article of faith that personal agency is somehow undermined by the so-called role playing in debate. Debate is role-playing whether we imagine government action or imagine individual action. Imagining myself starting a socialist revolution in America is no less of a fantasy than imagining myself making a difference on Capitol Hill. Furthermore, both fantasies influenced my personal and political development virtually ensuring a life of active, pro-social, political participation. Neither fantasy reduced the likelihood that I would spend my life trying to make the difference I imagined. One fantasy actually does make a greater difference: the one that speaks the language of political power. The other fantasy disables action by making one a laughingstock to those who wield the language of power. Fantasy motivates and role-playing trains through visualization. Until we can imagine it, we cannot really do it. Role-playing without question teaches students to be comfortable with the language of power, and that language paves the way for genuine and effective political activism. Debates over the relative efficacy of political strategies for pro-social change must confront governmental power at some point. There is a fallacy in arguing that movements represent a better political strategy than voting and person-to-person advocacy. Sure, a full-scale movement would be better than the limited voice I have as a participating citizen going from door to door in a campaign, but so would full-scale government action. Unfortunately, the gap between my individual decision to pursue movement politics and the emergence of a full-scale movement is at least as great as the gap between my vote and democratic change. They both represent utopian fiat. Invocation of Mitchell to support utopian movement fiat is simply not supported by his work, and too often, such invocation discourages the concrete actions he argues for in favor of the personal rejectionism that under girds the political cynicism that is a fundamental cause of voter and participatory abstention in America today.

1. Topical version of the aff solves – you could’ve defended a policy action that \_\_\_ (specific to round).
2. Voters:

Fairness/education

Drop arg

Competing interps

### **Military Service**

1. Interpretation: The affirmative must defend the desirability of making serving time in the military or armed forces compulsory for citizens in the United States.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
4. Textuality – **National service** is defined by Cambridge Dictionary[[1]](#footnote-1) as: “the system in some countries by which young people, especially men, are ordered by law to spend a period of time in the armed forces” and by Oxford Dictionaries as “the system in some countries in which young people have to do military training for a period of time”

Prefer: a) It’s the only result on two of the most reputed English dictionaries, b) all example sentences for “national service” reference military service, and c) the cultural context feature defines national service as conscription, which means my definitions outweigh on common usage and germaneness to literature.

Textuality is an independent voter: a) The resolution’s wording determines division of ground and guides pre-round prep, b) it regulates which forms of education are legitimate under the topic, and c) theoretical standards are meant to resolve textual interps, but if the interp isn’t textual in the first place, the theoretical standards are irrelevant.
5. Topic lit – All past examples of compulsory national service in the U.S. were military-related, e.g. conscription in Civil, Vietnam, and World Wars and National Guard, whereas public service programs like the CCC and PeaceCorps were only voluntary employment opportunities. Topic lit guides prep so it’s key to clash, which is an independent voter since fairness and education don’t matter if we can’t even have a debate in the first place. Also key to RW education because historical measures set precedent for current policy.
6. Advocacy and research skills – Debate over military policy encourages critical engagement with institutions and refining unique research skills.

**Rech** (Mathew Rech, Neil Jenkings, Alison Williams, Rachel Woodward, “Geography, military geography, and critical military studies,” Critical Military Studies Vol. 1 Issue 1; 2015)
We argue that the study of the military, of militarism, and of processes of militarization, should not be undertaken solely for its own sake, but should also be guided by [for] the possibility of engagement with the forces and institutions responsible, and should not be bashful about doing so. There are two reasons for this. First, to be critical is to be engaged in critique; it is not to be dismissive. Critical engagement with military forces, and military and militarized institutions, can be underpinned by an understanding of these institutions as accountable to the civilian world, and necessarily understood as potentially open to collaboration and knowledge exchange, even where this idea may initially appear ridiculous. Our backgrounds in human geography and sociology, with their rich methodological traditions of fieldwork and of co-inquiry and recognition of the necessity for academic labour as a communicative and engaged social practice, prompt us to return continually to questions about the possibilities and limits ozf collaboration with military institutions. The question which follows, then, is aboutS the opportunities a critical military studies might provide for envisioning and promoting possibilities for change within the institutions and practices which constitute its focus. This is not a simple issue. There are issues of visibility and voice at play, of making critiques heard not just within scholarly communities but more broadly within social debates. Critiques are often complex entities, arguments drawing on a range of empirical evidence and political positions which may be nuanced in ways that more simplistic positions (such as “pro-military” or “anti-military”) might find hard to accommodate. Far better that they are conducted with an intention in mind to inculcate change, even where that seems on the face of it to be unlikely, than not at all. That seems, to us, to be the point. The second reason for wanting to open up a space for considering the potential of engagement with military institutions, organizations, and personnel as part of the critical military project concerns issues of access. Military-related research can be quite different from other social scientific inquiry in other social contexts because of issues of secrecy and security (some justifiable, some less so) in these institutions (see Williams et al., forthcoming). To be engaged in informed critique may require the collection of reliable empirical evidence. This is partly a question of access and trust. This may also be a question of direct collaboration around research, including through the provision of defence funding.1 In our view, the critical military studies project has to develop on the basis of informed critique in which the nuances and complexities of civil-military relations are identified, rendered transparent (or as transparent as any other complex social phenomenon might be) and shared across academic, military, and other civilian spheres. This requires direct engagement with military forces, and a critical approach to those encounters. Thus, critical military geography offers opportunities to strive for progressive change in social sciences’ engagements with the military, militarism, and its processes of enactment, which enable us to undertake critical inquiry into military phenomena.

Also, military education o/w on pertinence because compulsory community service already exists in the U.S., e.g. you need a certain amount of community service to graduate high school, but compulsory military service doesn’t.

1. Topical version of the aff solves their offense – they can explain why community service is good for \_\_\_\_\_\_.
2. Voters:

Education

Drop the debater­

Competing interps

No RVIs: 1) T is key to set standards on the topic and check affirmative advocacies

*Education > fairness*

### **Community Service**

1. Interpretation: The affirmative must defend the desirability of a policy action that makes performing national community service compulsory for citizens in the United States.
2. Violation:X
3. Standards:
4. Textuality – “National service” denotes *community* service:

**Boyte** (Harry Boyte, “The Work and Workers of Democracy,” Huffington Post; April 2016)
She analyzes three major national service programs in American history, the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s; Volunteers in Service to America, begun by the Kennedy administration in the 1960s; and AmeriCorps, Bill Clinton’s signature service program which Barack Obama expanded. All had similarities. “Service” meant making a contribution to the nation and to communities. All had cross-partisan support. All had educational elements. But they understood service quite differently. It made a difference. The Civilian Conservation Corps, which involved over three million young men from 1933 to 1942 in conservation effort like planting trees (sometimes it was called the “tree army”), building shelters and roads in parks, and many other activities, had a strong emphasis on public work - collective work that was visible and helped to build the nation’s commonwealth, the national park system. Partly because of the work focus the CCC had enormous visibility — even now, far more Americans know about the CCC than VISTA or AmeriCorps. It had also impacts that the other two service programs, focused on civic virtue, didn’t have. The young men of the CCC developed great pride in their work. They also learned identities of citizens through their work. They were not volunteers or people taking an idealistic break from the rest of their lives. Clinton described AmeriCorps as “taking time out to serve.” That citizen identity of the CCC expressed through work, in contrast, stayed with them into everyday work, which Nan Kari and I discovered when we interviewed many veterans of the CCC for our book, Building America: The Democratic Promise of Public Work. The work focus of the CCC — and other programs like the Works Progress Administration — contributed to the sense that democracy was something people were making in the 1930s. The historian Lisabeth Cohen wrote a book, Making a New Deal, whose title conveys the point. We need to emphasize policies and practices that advance the work of making and sustaining democracy schools and the larger democracy. We need initiatives, like a new version of Cooperative Education, which tie liberal arts and citizenship to work experiences and also prepare students for citizenship expressed through their work in the future.

Textuality is an independent voter: a) The resolution’s wording determines division of ground and guides pre-round prep, b) it regulates which forms of education are legitimate under the topic, and c) theoretical standards are meant to resolve textual interps, but if the interp isn’t textual in the first place, the theoretical standards are irrelevant.

1. Topic lit – All historical examples of national service are community-based to improve domestic lives, e.g. the CCC, National and Community Service Act of 1990, Domestic Volunteer Service Act 1973, and Edward M. Kennedy Service Act (2009).

Topic lit guides prep so it’s key to clash, which is an independent voter since fairness and education don’t matter if we can’t even have a debate in the first place. Also key to RW education because historical measures set precedent for current policy.

1. Voters:

*Education/education o/w*

Competing interps

Drop the debater

No RVIs

### **Can’t Spec Region/People**

1. Interpretation: The affirmative must defend that national service is compulsory for the entire U.S. population/(throughout the entire territory of the United States). To clarify, the affirmative can’t only make national service compulsory for \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
4. Textuality – “In” means throughout:

Words and Phrases 59 (Thomson West (PDNS3566), pg. 546; 1959)
In the Act of 1861 providing that justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction “in” their respective counties to hear and determine all complaints, the word “in” should be construed to mean[s] “throughout” such counties. Reynolds v. Larkin, 14, p. 114, 117, 10 Colo. 126.

Textuality is an independent voter: a) The resolution’s wording determines division of ground and guides pre-round prep, b) it regulates which forms of education are legitimate under the topic, and c) theoretical standards are meant to resolve textual interps, but if the in­­terp isn’t textual in the first place, the theoretical standards are irrelevant.

1. Topic lit – Every historical example of compulsory national service in the U.S. applied to all citizens, e.g. National and Community Service Act of 1990 and conscription during the Vietnam and World Wars. Topic lit guides prep so it’s key to clash, which is an independent voter since fairness and education don’t matter if we can’t even have a debate in the first place. Also key to RW education because historical measures set precedent for current policy.
2. Limits – a) Over-limits the topic because they restrict the resolution to whichever group they want, which generates a million affs. There’s no way for me to predict which group they’ll defend, which means the debater with the most arbitrary advocacy would win.

Disclosure doesn’t solve b/c you’re more prepped on your own strat than I am (which is especially true if your aff is uncommon) and it’s also a horrible norm to endorse if everyone is running drastically different affs, even if they’re disclosed, since debaters won’t clash on the resolution’s core issues. Key to fairness because the better debater should win, not the one with the most arbitrary advocacy.

b) Qualitative ground – Specifying a group allows them to pick trivially true ground, **e.g. saying we should only make military service compulsory for soldiers, which means it’s nearly impossible to negate.** Key to fairness because we need equal access to arguments.

c) Breadth – over-limiting means we restrict ourselves to a tiny subset of the population. It’s improbable that the government would make it compulsory only for the exact subset they specify, so any in-round education wouldn’t be transferable to the RW.

1. Voters:

Fairness/education

Competing interps

Drop the debater

No RVIs

### **Must Spec Actor**

1. Interpretation: The affirmative must specify, in the text of the 1AC, the actor who enforces compulsory national service.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
4. Stable advocacy – The word “compulsory” is ambiguous because there are various forms of accountability, e.g. from the entire USFG or from local courts, which means: a) they can moot neg offense by defending the most strategic enforcer in the 1AR, and b) allows them to make sweeping claims about solvency that isn’t within the capacity of any single actor, which I can’t argue against because they can claim the actor is irrelevant. Key to fairness because debaters need stable offense to win.
5. Phil ed – Moral theories are agent-specific, which means lack of clarification prevents productive philosophical discussion. O/w other education because a) even if topical education is good, a moral framework contextualizes which impacts are valuable, b) topical education is out-of-round since we all research the same topic, but we all read different philosophies – means clash from phil ed is unique to in-round.
6. Voters:

Fairness/education

Competing interps

Drop the debater

No RVIs

CX doesn’t check:

1. They should be held to text – a) CX answers can be misheard or intentionally deceptive, b) judges don’t flow CX
2. Doesn’t solve pre-round prep from disclosure and prep during the 1AC. This is key because I form my 1NC strat before round and during the aff so if I wait until CX, I have to reformulate my strat completely during prep
3. If it’s the neg’s burden to ask in CX, they’ll just hope people forget and they can still be abusive

## **Theory - Generic**

### **Theory vs. Spikes**

#### **Spec Ex. of 1NC Strat**

1. Interpretation: If the affirmative reads preemptive theoretical arguments, they must explicitly identify in the text of the 1AC an example of a 1NC strategy that would trigger no violations.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
1) Substantive education – Preserves substance because a) ensures I won’t unknowingly violate their theoretical arguments, b) deters the aff from baiting theory violations to uplayer, and c) decreases likelihood of the neg running metatheory if they’re convinced that there’s a viable substantive strategy. Substantive education outweighs other education because it focuses on portable, real-world knowledge.
2) Time skew – I’m in a double bind because I either have to a) spend an absurd amount of time contriving a strategy that doesn’t violate any theoretical arguments or b) run theory, which means I have to waste time answering their wall of preemptive theoretical arguments. If the aff identifies a viable strategy, I can go for substance without the time suck. Key to fairness because reasonable time investments are necessary to win the ballot.
3) Strat skew – The implications of their theoretical arguments don’t become clear until the 1AR, so I can’t account for how they’ll be leveraged until it’s too late. If they identify a 1NC strategy, it gives me insight into which strategies would avoid their unpredictable 1AR extrapolations. Strat skew key to fairness since it constrains the ability to create winnable positions.
4. Voters:

Fairness/education

Drop the aff debater

Competing interps

No RVIs

CX doesn’t check:

1. They should be held to text – a) CX answers can be misheard or intentionally deceptive, b) judges don’t flow CX
2. With multiple theory spikes, the aff will waste my CX time by evading answers – means I can’t use CX for strategic purposes
3. Doesn’t solve pre-round prep from disclosure and prep during the 1AC. I form my 1NC strat before round and during the aff, so if I wait until CX, I have to reformulate my strat completely during prep.
4. If it’s the neg’s burden to ask in CX, they’ll just hope people forget and they can still be abusive

#### **Spikes in One Section**

1. Interpretation: If the affirmative reads preemptive theoretical arguments and theoretical justifications for a framework or burden in the 1AC, then the theoretical arguments and justifications must all be put in a single section at the top of the case.
2. Violation: X
3. Standards:
1) Flowability – If theoretical arguments are in opposite parts of the flow but all interact with each other, the theory debate gets muddled with cross-apps: a) Flowability is necessary for clash, which controls education, since I can’t answer arguments that I miss on the flow. Also means if I’m unable to engage in theoretical clash because the flow is messy, you’ll just go for outs on substance, b) Key to resolvabilty, since it’s harder for judges to arbitrate techy theory rounds when the flow is messy; resolvability is an independent voter since it impedes the judge’s ability to make a decision.

2) Strat skew – a) If spikes are hidden at the bottom, it’s impossible to formulate a 1NC strategy during the reading of the 1AC because I don’t know what constraints I’m under – makes prepping a strategy harder, b) if all the theoretical arguments are in different spots on the flow, I’ll miss potential ways for you to cross apply them, which means I’ll drop arguments that are necessary for my strategy; strat skew key to fairness since it constrains the ability to create winnable positions.

1. Voters:

Fairness/education

Drop debater

Competing interps

No RVIs

### **Theory vs. Perms**

#### **2NR: Multiple Perms Bad**

Don’t evaluate any 1AR perms if there are multiple:

1. Time skew – Each blippy perm is a no-risk issue for the aff since they’re all independent reasons to affirm, but they’re NIBs for me since I have to beat them back but can’t win off of them. Also, unequal time tradeoff between reading vs. answering perms means I spend substantially more time on them; controls fairness since reasonable time investments are necessary to win.
2. Strat skew – Even if I generate quality arguments against multiple perms, the aff can extend the one I undercovered and win by blowing it up for 3 minutes. If they only read one perm, I can make multiple arguments against it and the aff has less opportunity to explode a tiny issue in the 2AR; strat skew key to fairness because strategies win the ballot.

#### **2NR: Need Perm Text**

Reject any 1AR perms unless the aff provided the perm text *verbatim* either written down or typed up before the speech:

1. Stable advocacy—They can use the 2AR to re-contextualize the perm and collapse to it, so text is necessary to pin them down to their initial representation; otherwise, every 2AR can strategically moot 2NR offense. Key to fairness because debaters need stable offense to win.
2. Argument quality – Means the aff has to invest time writing perms out during prep and thinking through them rather than just blitzing off subpar arguments as no-risk issues. Key to education because better arguments are conducive to better understandings.

Providing the text afterwards doesn’t solve: a) It won’t be exact, and a small distinction can change the advocacy’s meaning, b) dishonest debaters will purposely revise the perm to be phrased more strategically than it originally was.

#### **2NR: Intrinsic Perms Bad**

Reject perms that add additional planks to the 1AC advocacy – kills the ability of the neg to formulate a 1NC strat since it’s impossible to predict every possible plank the aff can add to the perm in the 1AR. Intrinsic perms also kill neg ground because any neg offense can be outmaneuvered with arbitrary planks.

#### **2NR: Severance Perms Bad**

Reject perms that sever components of the 1AC advocacy – the aff’s ability to shift makes it impossible to engage because they can sever out of neg indicts by removing components of the AC in the 1AR. Further, the neg’s inability to predict what the aff will sever from prevents formulation of a 1NC strat.

1. http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/national-service [↑](#footnote-ref-1)