

# Judging Policy Debate

Rich Edwards  
Baylor University  
July 2013

# Judging paradigms

---

## Stock Issues: Legal Model

- Topicality
- Significance of Harm
- Inherency
- Solvency
- Advantage Over Disadvantage

## Policy Making: Legislative Model

- Weigh advantages versus disadvantages

## Hypothesis Testing: Social Science Model

- Each negative position (some of which may be contradictory) tests the truth of the affirmative; it must stand good against all tests to be true.

## Tabula Rasa: Democracy/Anarchy Model

- Whatever basis for decision the debaters can agree on will be used as a judging standard.

## Game Player: Gaming Model

- Debate is a rule-governed game; you play by (and are judged by) the rules.

# Evaluating Topicality

---

## Standards

- Precision
- Each word has meaning
- Debatability
- Notice/Fairness
- Reasonability

## Violation

- What word(s) in the resolution have been violated?
- How should these words properly be defined?
- Applying the relevant standard, why does the definition offered demonstrate an aff violation?

## Impact

- Why is this a voting issue?

## Extratopicality

- Does the plan do the resolution and MORE?

# Evaluating Inherency

---

## Structural Inherency

- Law: The 1996 Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (Libertad) Act gives the force of law to an economic embargo of Cuba.
- Absence of Structure: Congress has voted down the proposal to extend credit to Cuba for agricultural purchases from the U.S.

## Attitudinal Inherency

- The Obama administration has declared that it will not lift the Cuban embargo so long as the Castros retain their dictatorial power.

# Evaluating Solvency

---

## Types of solvency arguments

- **Impracticability:** The plan will not work as planned (the plan proposes to guarantee a certain level of water supply to Mexico from the Colorado River, but drought conditions could make such a promise impossible to fulfill.)
- **Insufficiency:** Other causes will remain and perpetuate the problem (Even if the U.S. increases aid through the Merida Initiative, corruption among police and prison officials will prevent progress against drug dealers).
- **Counterproductivity:** This type of solvency argument holds that an attempt to solve the problem will actually make it worse (increasing U.S. economic engagement with the opposition political party in Venezuela will actually undermine their chance of winning the next presidential election because it will create the impression of outside influence).

# Evaluating Disads

---

## Link

- Why will the plan cause this?

## Uniqueness:

- Would the disad happen anyway, even without the plan?

## Brink/Linearity

- Is there any reason to believe that we are at a critical point or is the negative simply saying that the plan would cause more of something which is already happening?

## Impact

- Why would this be bad?
- Why would it outweigh the case advantages?

# Cuba, Mexico, Venezuela

## Disadvantages

---

 Politics

 U.S. Hegemony

 Environmental Disaster (oil development in the Gulf)

 Saudi Arabia or Russia economic shifts (resulting from loss of U.S. oil purchases)

 Free Trade causes poverty

 Undermine Human Rights

 Balloon Effect (Squeezing drug dealers creates even more problems)

# Evaluating Counterplans

---

## Nontopicality

- Is it necessary to be nontopical?
- What word(s) in the resolution does the counterplan fail to meet?

## Competitiveness

- Mutual Exclusivity
- Net Benefits
- Permutations

## Types

- Agent (commercial action or state counterplans)
- Exclusion (exclude certain products or activities from engagement)
- Plan inclusive (do the plan in such a way as to avoid the politics Disad)

# Evaluating Kritiks

---

## Types

- Language
- Causation
- Power Relationships
- Feminism

## Links

- What has the team argued, advocated, or said which makes this kritik relevant?

## Decision import

- Why does the kritik give a reason to vote aff or neg in the debate?