A. Interpretation: debaters must defend the hypothetical enactment of a policy, “Resolved” makes the topic a state action **Words and Phrases 64**[[1]](#footnote--1)

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”**.

B. Violation: Their AFF talks about what juries should do not what the United States or any other government should do.

C. Reasons to prefer: 1.Text if I win the violation then the AFF case isn’t topical which controls a massive internal link to fairness and education. **Nebel 15**[[2]](#footnote-0)

By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach. This** rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: **it would be unfair to expect the negative to prepare against anything other than the resolution, because that is the only mutually acceptable basis for preparation; the educational benefits that are unique to debate stem[s] from clash focused on a proposition determined beforehand.** The inference to **the priority of semantic[s] considerations is** **simple. Consider the following** argument: **We ought to debate the resolution**. **The resolution means X. Therefore, We ought to debate X**. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic considerations for or against X do not**, in themselves, **support or deny this second premise**. **They might show that it would be better** or worse **if the resolution meant X, but sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. They are (if anything) reasons to change the topic, contrary to the topicality rule. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, not against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above

#### 2. Policymaking education, obviously absent a policy it’s impossible to have a productive discussion on what a policymaker would or should do. Role-playing as the government is key to real world education—3 unique reasons. Joyner ‘99[[3]](#footnote-1)

Use of the debate can be an effective pedagogical tool for education in the social sciences. Debates, like other role-playing simulations, help students understand different perspectives on a policy issue by adopting a perspective as their own. But, unlike other simulation games, debates do not require that a student participate directly in order to realize the benefit of the game. Instead of developing policy alternatives and experiencing the consequences of different choices in a traditional role-playing game, debates present the alternatives and consequences in a formal, rhetorical fashion before a judgmental audience. Having the class audience serve as jury helps each student develop a well-thought-out opinion on the issue by providing contrasting facts and views and enabling audience members to pose challenges to each debating team. These debates ask undergraduate students to examine the international legal implications of various United States foreign policy actions. Their chief tasks are to assess the aims of the policy in question, determine their relevance to United States national interests, ascertain what legal principles are involved, and conclude how the United States policy in question squares with relevant principles of international law. Debate questions are formulated as resolutions, along the lines of: "Resolved: The United States should deny most-favored-nation status to China on human rights grounds;" or "Resolved: The United States should resort to military force to ensure inspection of Iraq's possible nuclear, chemical and biological weapons facilities;" or "Resolved: The United States' invasion of Grenada in 1983 was a lawful use of force;" or "Resolved: The United States should kill Saddam Hussein." In addressing both sides of these legal propositions, the student debaters must consult the vast literature of international law, especially the nearly 100 professional law-school-sponsored international law journals now being published in the United States. This literature furnishes an incredibly rich body of legal analysis that often treats topics affecting United States foreign policy, as well as other more esoteric international legal subjects. Although most of these journals are accessible in good law schools, they are largely unknown to the political science community specializing in international relations, much less to the average undergraduate. [\*386] By assessing the role of international law in United States foreign policy- making, students realize that United States actions do not always measure up to international legal expectations; that at times, international legal strictures get compromised for the sake of perceived national interests, and that concepts and principles of international law, like domestic law, can be interpreted and twisted in order to justify United States policy in various international circumstances. In this way, the debate format gives students the benefits ascribed to simulations and other action learning techniques, in that it makes them become actively engaged with their subjects, and not be mere passive consumers. Rather than spectators, students become legal advocates, observing, reacting to, and structuring political and legal perceptions to fit the merits of their case. The debate exercises carry several specific educational objectives. First, students on each team must work together to refine a cogent argument that compellingly asserts their legal position on a foreign policy issue confronting the United States. In this way, they gain greater insight into the real-world legal dilemmas faced by policy makers. Second, as they work with other members of their team, they realize the complexities of applying and implementing international law, and the difficulty of bridging the gaps between United States policy and international legal principles, either by reworking the former or creatively reinterpreting the latter. Finally, research for the debates forces students to become familiarized with contemporary issues on the United States foreign policy agenda and the role that international law plays in formulating and executing these policies. 8 The debate thus becomes an excellent vehicle for pushing students beyond stale arguments over principles into the real world of policy analysis, political critique, and legal defense.

D. Voter fairness is a voter, because debate is a competitive activity and therefore requires the element of being fair to be legimament; education is a voter because it’s the portable purpose of debate.

Evaluate with competing inteprs, because reasonability is arbitrary and leads to intervention

Drop the debater

1. The NC was skewed. I can’t redo it after the 1AR shifts.

2. Key to deterrence, otherwise debaters will keep running stuff for a time skew, and in case it doesn’t get caught

3. It’s the only option, the argument would be the whole AC, so they would functionally lose there.

4. Depth. Reject-the-arg theory forces us to cover theory and substance which leads to shallow theory debates that set worse norms for the activity.
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