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The aff must prove that affirming the principle stated by the resolution is better justified than negating it. But there are different kinds of justification. Most reasons for accepting a principle have to do with epistemic evidence for the principle’s truth, but we can also have pragmatic reasons for belief. Jordan:

Jeff Jordan, [Professor of Philosophy at the University of Delaware],  "Pragmatic Arguments and Belief in God", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/pragmatic-belief-god/>. JMN

As with so much in philosophy, the first recorded employment of a pragmatic argument is found in Plato. At *Meno* 86b-c, Socrates tells Meno that believing in the value of inquiry is justified because of the positive impact upon one's character: Meno: Somehow or other I believe you are right. Socrates: I think I am. I shouldn't like to take my oath on the whole story, but one thing I am ready to fight for as long as I can, in word and act—that is, that we shall be better, braver, and more active men if we believe it right to look for what we don't know than if we believe there is no point in looking because what we don't know we can never discover. Meno: There too I am sure you are.[[1](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pragmatic-belief-god/notes.html%22%20%5Cl%20%221)] Paraphrased, Socrates' point is if being better, braver, and more active are among our desires, and if believing that inquiry is permissible facilitates our becoming better, braver, and more active, then we have reason, pragmatic reason, to believe that inquiry is permissible. Socrates' argument is an argument for the permissibility of a certain belief, based on the benefits of believing that certain belief. Pragmatic arguments are practical in orientation, justifying actions that are thought to facilitate the achievement of our goals, or the satisfaction of our desires. If among your goals is A, and if doing such and such results in your achieving A, then, all else being equal, you have reason to do such and such: Doing α brings about, or contributes in bringing about, β, and It is in your interest that β obtain. So, you have reason to do α. As presented this is a particular kind of pragmatic argument, a prudential argument. Prudential pragmatic arguments are predicated upon one's preferences or goals or self-interest. As we will see, there are pragmatic arguments that are not narrowly prudential but are moral in nature. Pragmatic arguments are relevant to belief-formation, since inculcating a belief is an action. There are, broadly speaking, two kinds of pragmatic arguments that have to do with belief-formation. The first is an argument that recommends taking steps to believe a proposition because, if it should turn out to be true, the benefits gained from believing that proposition will be impressive. This first kind of pragmatic argument we can call a “truth-dependent” pragmatic argument, or more conveniently a “dependent-argument,” since the benefits are obtained only if the relevant state of affairs occurs. The prime example of a dependent-argument is a pragmatic argument that uses a calculation of expected utility and employs the Expectation Rule to recommend belief: whenever both probability and utility values are known, one should choose to do an act which has the greatest expected utility. Among the various versions of his wager argument, Pascal employs this Rule in a version which states that no matter how small the probability that God exists, as long as it is a positive, non-zero probability, the expected utility of theistic belief will dominate the expected utility of disbelief. Given the distinction between (A) having reason to think a certain proposition is true, and (B) having reason to induce belief in that proposition, taking steps to generate belief in a certain proposition may be the rational thing to do, even if that proposition lacks sufficient evidential support. The benefits of believing a proposition can rationally take precedence over the evidential strength enjoyed by a contrary proposition; and so, given an infinite expected utility, Pascal's Wager contends that forming the belief that God exists is the rational thing to do, no matter how small the likelihood that God exists.

Those pragmatic reasons can be about the consequences of our beliefs but also about the language used to state them. Representations of our language affect our ability to act effectively and interact with others. Haste writes:

Helen Haste, [PhD of Psychology at the University of Bath], “Communitarianism and the Social Construction of Morality”, 1998. NC

Communitarian thinkersstart from a very different psychological tradition. They emphasise the **primacy of language and social interaction in the generation of meaning [is important]**. Taylor argues that **human life is ‘fundamentally dialogic …. We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence defining an identity, through our acquisition of rich human languages of expression.**’ (1991 p 32). This aligns the communitarian ontological position with social constructionists like John Shotter (1993) and Rom HarrZ (HarrZ and Gillett, 1994) who argue that the primary human reality is face-to-face conversation. **If social interaction is the crucible of meaning, then the child learns about morality through discourse and through social practices**, both explicit and implicit. **The ‘meaning’ of something – including the meaning of our own identity and our morality – depends on what is comprehensible and recognized within our social community. Social beings create their identity through shared discourse and language** (Shotter, 1993). Communities are multiple; we are members of many communities which each offer us identity, and personal meaning, and within each different elements and skills are salient. Cultural narratives, stories and traditions feed directly into our identity, signaling valued attributes and behaviours, and giving an explanation for our past and present. Crucially, we also recognize that these are shared by those whom we thus define as members of our community. A moral obligation can only have meaning within a social context. Richard Shweder describes taboos and practices found amongst rural Hindus in India which are quite morally meaningless to Americans, because they are associated with beliefs about pollution which are not shared (Shweder et al, 1987). However practices may be widely condemned, but for different reasons – believing that rape is wrong because it defiles the victim’s purity, is very different from seeing it as wrong because treats her as an object rather than a person.

This is empirically proven- the language associated with domestic violence is crucial to solve abuse and ensure victims are protected. Fountain et al:

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

Definitions are important because without a clear understanding of what domestic violence is, it can be difficult for survivors to determine if they are experiencing domestic violence. **Providers who do not share a definition of domestic violence may refuse to recognize this violence in LGBTQ relationships and opt to deny services**. Further, **without a nuanced understanding of the unique aspects of LGBTQ domestic violence, providers may choose to adopt a „one size fits all‟ mentality where they claim to deliver services to all equally when LGBTQ survivors are not actually receiving culturally competent or equal services**. Despite dilemmas regarding **definitions**, they **are important as they help to frame and name acts of violence and to hold perpetrators of such violence accountable**.

The counter-advocacy is that its morally permissible for victims to use deadly force as a deliberate response to repeated intimate partner violence.

First, the term “domestic” creates hetero-normative tendencies excluding LGBT victims--- the domestic violence laws in California proves. Fountain 2:

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

―Intimate Partner Violence‖ and ―Domestic Violence‖ - Distinctions Between the Terms Use of the term “domestic violence” to describe violence in LGBTQ intimate relationships has been disfavored by some feminist researchers. They contend that **the language of “domesticity” reflects the patriarchy and hetero-normative tendencies of the law from which it springs, obscuring the dimensions of gender and power at play. These tendencies have various expressions in state law, but even those with provisions around LGBTQ intimate partnerships tend exhibit some form of sanctioned discrimination in either text or practice**. For example, **in order to access a legal remedy under California‟s Domestic Violence Protection Act** (“DVPA”), **one must fall into one of the Act‟s categories of “protected persons,” as well as demonstrate, to the Court‟s satisfaction, “reasonable proof of a past act or acts of abuse.”** Categories of “protected persons” under the Act include being the Spouse, Cohabitant, Co-parent, Child, or Blood relative to the alleged perpetrator, or sharing a Dating or Engagement Relationship with the alleged perpetrator. Thus, there is no conduct which alone is sufficient to satisfy the extension of domestic civil protection orders; whatever proofs the alleged victim provides of a past act (or acts) of abuse by the alleged perpetrator, no protection order will be granted without establishing also that the relationship between the alleged victim and the alleged perpetrator is one which the Act anticipated in crafting the law.

That turns case because LGBTQ intimate partnerships are excluded from the law, so they aren’t protected, increasing discriminatory abuse.

Second, the term “domestic” justifies continued violence against the victim because it “domesticizes” the private sphere, which makes the abuse immune from the law. Rivera:

Jenny Rivera [Professor of Law at the City University of New York] Violence Against Women Act and the Construction of Multiple Consciousness in the Civil Rights and Feminist Movement,”, 1995. FD

Violence against women by intimate partners is commonly referred to as “domestic violence.” In previous articles, I have voiced my opposition to the use of **the word “domestic” as a qualifier for this category of violence** because it **characterizes violence against women** by current and former spouces and lovers **as** **sufficiently distinct from all other forms of violence** so **as to justify** wholly different, sometimes, **inadequate**, **sanctioning of such violence**. See Jenny Rivera, Domestic Violence Against Latinas by Latino Males: An Analysis of Race, National Origin, and Gender Differentials, 14 B.C. Third World L.J.231, 232 n.5 (1994) [hereinafter domestic Violene against Latinas]; Jenny Rivera, Puerto Rico’s Domestic Violence Prevention and Intervention Law and the United States Violence Against Women Act of 1994: The Limitations of Legislative Responses, 5 Colum. J. Gender & L. 78, 79 n.8 (1995) [hereinafter Puerto Rico’s Domestic Violence Law]. Undeniably, violence against women by these categories of perpretrators is different from other violence crimes commited by strangers or nonintimate acquantances and relatives. However, **the use of “domestic” as a qualifying term does more than simply categorize based on the status of the abuser. This terminology has**, in effect, **“domesticized” the very act of violence and** **facilitated the insulation of this violence from public scrutiny and criminalized**. See Elizabeth M. Schneider, The Violence of Privacy, 24 CONN. L. Rev. 973, 977 (1991) (“**thus, in the so-called private sphere of domestic and family life, which is purportedly immune from law, there is always the selective application of law**. Signifincantly**, the selective application of law invokes ‘privacy’ a a rationalte for immunity in order to protect male domination**.”)

TURNS case because the aff’s rhetoric entrenches the public/private dichotomy allowing for continued abuse.

The public/private sphere dichotomy is awful. Justifies things like the Virginia Tech shooting and other school shootings. Angela Battery explains:

Angela j. hattery “intimate partner violenc”

**On april 16, 2007 the worst school shooting in the history of the united states – to date – took place when a gunman shot thirty-two members of the Virginia tech university campus** community before turning the gun on himself and becoming the third third “victim”. Early speculation about the motive focused on a possible domestic dispute. Perhaps the most troubling aspect of this situation is the fact that many accounts of the morning of april 16, 2007, indicate that **[Virginia Tech’s] the campus police did not immediately recognize the risk that the shooter presented to the entire Virginia tech campus because the first homicide committed that morning was believed to be a domestic violence homicide**. **Virginia tech president Charles steger said authorities believed that the shooting at the dorm was a domestic dispute and mistakenly thought the gunman had fled the campus**. **We had no reason to suspect any other incident was going to occur he said.** **The events surrounding the Virginia tech shooting are troubling for many reasons, first and foremost because the decision by the Virginia tech president implies that domestic violence homicide is nothing to take too seriously, and certainly it does not constitute a threat to public safety in the larger community**. And yet **in many cases of domestic violence homicide, other victims are maimed and or murdered**. **Even more troubling is the fact that in examining other school shootings, a clear and disturbing pattern emerges. Beginning with the texas tower shootings at the university of texas, Austin, in 1966, many school shootings either began with or involved domestic violence homicide**. In the texas tower shootings, the shooter, Charles Whitman, murdered his wife and his mother the night before the terrible rampage in Austin. **Luke woodham, the school shooter in pearl, missipppiip, also began his rampge by shooting his girlfriend and mother**. And, of course, the most recent tragedy at Virginia tech as believed to begin with a domestic violence homicide. In all of these cases, had law enforcement and meergecny responders taken the initla domestic violence homicide as a matter obf public safety, perhaps the greater targedies would have been avoided.

Third, the term “domestic violence” disguises the criminal nature of the violence. Only the term intimate partner violence solves. Douglas -

Heather Douglas “Crime in the intimate sphere: prosecutions of intimate partner violence” 7 newscastle l. rev 80 (2004)

In this paper I have eschewed the use of **the term ‘domestic violence’**, this term has suffered criticism in recent times. It has been suggested that the use of the term ultimately **hampers further enquiry as it denotes a status relationship as well as a special one, separate such violence out from and somehow modifying ordinary violence**. Others note that although **the term**, when it was initially contrived, was both radical and useful, it may now work to **trivialize[s] the violence which broadly is occurring in the context of the home**. One judge recently noted that he disliked the term ‘domestic violence’ because **the term disguised its criminal nature**. It is thus difficult to know how to appropriately name the violence that is the subject of this paper. **Its relationship context and gendered nature is extremely relevant** and important **to understanding and dealing with it**. Rather than trivializing it, its status should be seen to exacerbate its seriousness, it is separate from other violence, it is worse. **This type of violence is** worse and **more serious than many other forms of violence because its perpetrators exploit the intimate knowledge they have of their victim** and because it frequently exploits a power imbalance between the parties. **As a result of these considerations I have used** **the term ‘intimate partner violence’** to **denote[s]** that **violence which takes place between those in** defacto or marriage relationships or those formerly in such **relationships**. Previous research has found that most DVOs are applied for by women against their male intimates or previous intimates (rather than by men against women). This research supports the view that violence against women by men in intimate relationships is more likely to occur and generally more serious than violence against men by women. The violence discussed here is very much about gender and relationship and this is played out in the fact scenarios I will discuss below. The reality for women continues to be that they are more likely to suffer violence from their intimate partner (or previous partner) than any other person.

FInally, any risk of using the word “domestic violence” destroys discourse. Louise:

Mary Louise, journalist with the *London Morning Paper*, 4 (http://www.newswithviews.com/guest\_opinion/guest32.htm)

**Doublethink**, or reality control, **involves being aware of truthfulness, while at the same time professing carefully devised lies and believing both**, as our so-called leaders aptly demonstrate. **Political language is designed to make lies sound truthful, and to convey the opposite of actual intentions, in order to greatly influence public opinion**. Politically correct **terminology is the invention of a simplified new vocabulary that masks**, distorts, and alters the **true meanings of traditional definitions**. **It limits the range of ideas and emotions that are allowed to be expressed, and causes unnecessary confusion and conflict that restricts understanding, which makes it difficult to communicate rationally and effectively**. Control of language and information is necessary to condition citizens to love their oppressors, appreciate censorship, and tolerate brutality. Freedom is slavery, war is peace, and ignorance is strength. As George Washington said, "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened." In the words of George Orwell..."Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them." "1984" is his most famous work, in which a surveillant State enforces conformity through constant indoctrination, fear, lies, and punishment. It was out of the chaos of wars that the Party seized control. This novel introduced the concept of Big Brother and Newspeak, the fictional language that is supposed to eclipse Oldspeak (the existing English language), by the year 2050. The notion was to remove politically incorrect ideas in a vocabulary of dichotomies, euphemisms, and abbreviations. By doing so, making nonconformist thoughts a crime and free speech impossible, in a dreary Totalitarian State, where people cannot resist tyranny, and will surrender liberty for security. Not actually used in the book, "doublespeak" is related to "doubletalk" and the apparent combination of doublethink and newspeak. According to Orwell, "Thoughtcrime is the essential crime that contains all others in itself." The Orwellian concept of crimethink means to doubt the principles of Ingsoc, or even consider any thought that questions official state policy. Ingsoc, or English Socialism, is basically a modern political system of Oligarchical Collectivism, that reflects Stalinism with Machiavellian overtones. "Hate Crime" legislation fits right in with the Orwellian scenario, as the thought police patrol our neighborhoods.

This means that the use of deadly force in response to repeated domestic violence is permissible if and only if we refer to the situation as “intimate partner violence” and not “domestic violence”. This alternative principle solves 100% of the AFF offense as we permit the same action as the AFF except refer to the situation they are in as “intimate partner violence”. Given that the actions of both advocacies are indistinguishable, any risk of a net benefit, i.e. a reason why using the word “domestic violence” is bad, is a reason to negate.

And, if the alternative solves 100% of the AFF, you should vote on a net benefit even if it doesn’t link to a standard because [A] it becomes literally the only unique offense in the debate! You would have nothing else to vote on, and [B] every conception of morality would agree, holding all else equal, that perpetuating the abuse is bad. To get rid of the net benefit, they need to generate offense through a link or impact turn.

Finally, the discourse argument functions as both a link and an impact. It’s a link because it means language counts as a source of pragmatic reasons for belief, so my advocacy is competitive by net benefits. But it’s also a pre-fiat reason to negate: if language shapes reality, then you should reject the resolution’s language because this is the only real-world impact in the round. LD is a meaningful activity because it teaches us how to reason about values in public affairs, so vote neg because the aff contributes to a harmful way of framing domestic violence in public discussion, just as you should vote against debaters who use racial epithets.

# \*\*Theory\*\*

# Word PICS good

C/I: The neg may read one [list status of cp] word PIC that is textually competitive w/ at least one net benefit supported by evidence from a scholar in the relevant field of literature, and the negative may only PIC out of a word in the resolution that has literature from a scholar in the relevant field.

I meet

Net Benefits

 A] It demands a rigorous defense of each step of the affirmative’s argumentation that forces in-depth discussion. This is important because when taken to their logical extremes, a painfully in-depth discussion of one issue is more valuable than single sentences covering a thousand topics.

[Breadth inevitable over the course of multiple debates. Only chance for in depth discussion is an individual debate round]

B] Only words PICs force debaters to talk about specific words – two impacts 1] we become more tolerant of words used, which is crucial to a good understanding of our language and the knowledge when to use certain words and not others. 2] teaches us how to persuade people to adopt our advocacies and use the right words in context, which is crucial to advocacy skills because it helps us arrive at the optimal decision --- good advocacy skills only portable skill we learn from debate – ensures we have a defense ouf our language and help create social change.

C] Incentivizes Research – requires all debaters to critically analyze the implications of their arguments as well as inform themselves through research on common lines of thinking that criticize those assumptions. And, even if debaters don’t read the word PIC often, the threat of debaters reading it encourages research.

And not a voting issue.

Your deterrence arguments are false. Two warrants:

A) Threat of punishment encourages debaters to defend the theoretical legitimacy of their position and make it a reverse voting issue. It’s easy to get good at theory and defend a rule.

B) No internal link between dropping the debater and deterrence. Losing an argument is a sufficient deterrent to running abusive arguments – debaters will stop reading arguments that don’t win.

And, dropping debater bad for education.

A) Encourages theory whenever you can’t respond to a sick ass strategy. Sets a precedent to avoid research and plan out strategies to get a link to a violation.

B) Encourages debaters to go all in on theory --- prevents topical debates which are more educational b/c it’s more relevant to our everyday lives.

# Word PICS Good 2NR

The aff does not have a terminal impact --- the ultimate goal in debate is to hone decision making skills that can be used when we leave the activity --- word PICs ensure we put the affs advocacy to scrutiny and arrive at the optimal decision – this practice teaches us the portable skill to have a robust defense of the wording of our advocacies and helps build coalitions through the language we use. That form of advocacy skills prepares us to persuasively create social and political reform and ultimately enables us to solve domestic violence when we leave the activity.

Word PICs are crucial to optimal decision making – it ensures we evaluate and compare the words in the affs advocacy and refine them – creates better advocacy skills.

A] You should be prepared to focus in on every single word in the aff advocacy and the resolution --- that is the most unique link to advocacy skills. Kehl and Livingston:

D.G. Kehl and Howard Livingston, English at Arizona State University and Pace University, July 1999 (English Journal 88.6)

Second, **students’** own linguistic vulnerability should be demonstrated in a meaningful and convincing way. How would they react, for example, if while shopping they encounter “vegetarian leather” for plain, cheap vinyl; or “synthetic glass” for plastic; or, in place of down payment, they get “customer capital cost reduction”? Third, they **should be made more sensitive to language and how it works, not just denotation but connotation**, concrete versus abstract terms, specific versus general, adjectives as evaluative projections of a speaker or writer, slanted language, and much more. For example, they can be asked to consider how many times in a year they buy something simply on the persuasive appeal of words rather than on the genuine merits of the product, whether that product is sunglasses, clothes, vehicles, or food. Especially illuminating in developing sensitivity to language are exercises that ask students to distinguish differences in connotation among lists of so-called synonyms. For example, which of the following would they like to be called—and why: boy/girl, lad/lassie, kid, young person, youngster, tyke, juvenile, future citizen, Generation X-er, member of the rising generation? Lively discussions can be conducted on the connotative effects of the language of advertising. For example, why are certain words taboo in advertising, requiring the substitution of euphemisms: not “fat” but “full figured,” not “cheap” but “inexpensive,” not “used car” but “preowned automobile,” not “smell” but “aroma.” (A recent example of doublespeak for “stink” is “exceed the olfactory threshold.”) Fourth, **students should be taught not only to read critically but also to speak and write re responsibility** Wasn't’it Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch who noted that **a writer should be prepared to stand cross-examination on every word**? And as for reading critically, perhaps Thomas Carlyle said it best: “If we think of it, all that a university or final highest school can do for us is still but what the first school began doing—teach us to read.” Isn’t that at least a significant part of the English teacher’s job description? Finally, **students should be taught how to “talk back”** by disarming and defusing doublespeak through what Judith Butler calls “counter-appropriation” (or what Hugh Rank has called “intensifying” and “downplaying” in his Doublespeak Schema). Recent communication theory offers further direction for discussing doublespeak in the classroom. For example, even a brilliant, well-organized, and illustrated lecture on language manipulation may have limited success (the doublespeaker would call it “counterproductive”).

And, this means the word PIC is uniquely predictable b/c students should be able to defend every word they speak.

B] The language we use shapes our reality --- effects our ability to create constructive discourse --- connotations of domestic violence is crucial to solve abuse and ensure victims are protected. Fountain et al -

Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

Definitions are important because without a clear understanding of what domestic violence is, it can be difficult for survivors to determine if they are experiencing domestic violence. **Providers who do not share a definition of domestic violence may refuse to recognize this violence in LGBTQ relationships and opt to deny services**. Further, **without a nuanced understanding of the unique aspects of LGBTQ domestic violence, providers may choose to adopt a „one size fits all‟ mentality where they claim to deliver services to all equally when LGBTQ survivors are not actually receiving culturally competent or equal services**. Despite dilemmas regarding definitions, **they are important as they help to frame and name acts of violence and to hold perpetrators of such violence accountable**.

B] The language we use shapes our reality --- effects our ability to create constructive discourse --- serves as a prerequisite to taking action and is crucial to actually help victims in need.

Smith and Bell:

Phillipa Smith and Alan Bell [Philippa Smith is a PhD in discourses in national identity at AUT University in New Zealand, Allan Bell is Allan Bell is Professor of Language & Communication and the Director of the Institute of Culture, Discourse & Communication at Auckland University of Technology], “Unraveling the Web of Discourse Analysis” <http://www.aut.ac.nz/resources/research/research_institutes/ccr/sage_proofs_05-devereux-ch-04.pdf>

Foucault’s interest in the power play of specific discourses over society has influenced the postmodern connection between language and social structure (Devereux, 2003). This is echoed by Fairclough when referring to discursive practice contributing not just to the reproduction of society (‘social identities, social relationships, systems of knowledge and belief’), but also to the transformation of society (1992: 65). **Analysis of texts also enables identification of the representation, identity and stereotyping of groups and individuals. It allows for critical analysis, an awareness of persuasive language, and uncovers dominating social powers behind discourses.** Such critical analysis **[this] might not solve problems**, **but** it **is a prerequisite that has the ability to identify and analyze situations, and perhaps suggest ways of alleviating or resolving them** (Fairclough et al., 2004). The New Zealand Government, for example, recognized that promotional texts used by tobacco companies carried tempting lifestyle messages to influence, particularly, young people’s behaviour and their attitudes towards smoking. As a result, tobacco and advertising sponsorships were banned in the 1990s (Health NZ, 2005). A burgeoning of text types in society, largely brought about through developing technologies, compels researchers to seek understanding of social reality through analyzing the discourse of the texts and questioning them. Legal documents, advertisements, political and Government papers, company newsletters, propaganda leaflets, articles in newspapers, magazines, and books, television, radio and film, music and lyrics, performing arts and more recently the Internet, mobile phones, mobile television and computer games: these are just some examples of the proliferation of texts. Added to this are the changing and merging of existing discourses through processes of globalization of discourses and discourse genres (Fairclough, 2001).

That means I have the strongest and most unique link to advocacy skills.

I will now do two things. First, explain how you have no unique offense linking to any terminal impact. And second, kick your ass on the impact debate.

A2 Ground loss

1) Begs the question of what you should be researching. The reason you don’t have ground is because you haven’t researched the topic right. If I win any of my arguments about why a focus on words is good that turns your ground argument.

2) Newsflash buddy: you are not entitled to whatever ground you want.

3) The standard should not be ground skew but the quality of ground on both sides of my position. The ground is equally good. You have access to any of the following arguments a) discourse arguments why the word victim is good b) the word survivor is bad c) victim is key to promote sympathy and cause change.

A2 predictability

1] CI solves --- you should be required to research words b/c its published. My solvency advocate is not from a blog but has a PHD in law and sociology.

Saying its unpredictable b/c you don’t have answers doesn’t make sense. They are not providing you with the criterion for how we determine whether something is predictable. Only way to do this is what is the research norm. My arguments are consistent with the research norm so solves your predictability arguments.

2] All your internal links are inevitable --- judges you have seen before are unpredictable, new strategies are unpredictable, etc.

A2 Education

1] I solve education -- Their generic impact of education is not unique to debate. we can learn about DV by doing a presentation on it or gong to a woman’s shelter, but talking about the effects of particular words hones your decision-making skills by making you more persuasive.

2] only my impact is a prerequisite --- only reason why education is useful is if you can be persuasive and spread education, which severs their internal link to ground.

IMPACT DEBATE

\*\*Even if they win that word PICs are unfair and bad for debate, debaters need to learn the dark arts on how to defeat these kinds of positions. Inevitably when we leave the activity, we are going to be faced with unpredictable arguments that are challenging and that we haven’t predicted. We can’t whine and say “its unpredictable or strat skew” we are going to have to stand up and respond!

Advocacy skills comes first

A] Abuse inevitable in debates and in life. You will always be faced up against good strategies that make it hard to win, teams with more resources, people who are faster than you. Advocacy skills is the only unique external impact.

B] Fairness is silly b/c things will always be unfair. No learning if you ground your decisions on fairness.

C] Not unique to debate -- If you want a fair activity, go play board games. As a judge you should only evaluate what is the better model of debate.

D] Not a voting issue – their inability to handle a good strategy doesn’t mean you should drop me.

E] All their fairness argument assume a world where I am abusing the team reading things not specific to the aff or the resolution – but this is different.

My impact outweighs your impact

A] Encourages a unique skillset. It teaches debaters how to make the best kind of decisions and weigh the advantages and disadvantages of taking an action.

B] Promotes a portable skill that debaters will value once they leave the activity. Advocacy skills is crucial to becoming a good lawyer, interviewing for jobs, or even persuading people in general by knowing what are the merits and disadvantages of a particular action.

C] The thesis of the Iraq war was grounded in flawed advocacy skills – bush did not have to defend his policies against people on the far left, which allowed for massive atrocities and the death of thousands. Only my model of debate encourages debaters to make the optimal decision and avoids bad shit from happening in the real world with flawed advocates.