

NDT 2000 Final Round Ballots

Affirmative: Emory Jon Paul Lupo and Mike Horowitz

Negative: Michigan State Aaron Monick and Steve Donald

Timothy W. Mahoney, Director of Debate, Pace University

Congratulations to two fine teams both of which I've had the pleasure of judging several times this year. Both teams are outstanding representatives of their respective institutions and of debate in general. I consider it an honor to be judging this year's final round.

Although the line item veto counterplan must have been very enticing as a strategic choice the entire 2nr was spent on the kritik of territory. The primary claim being that failure to put subaltern groups at the forefront of analysis guarantees that they will continue to be oppressed and subject to violence. The analogy of Native Americans in the United States was referred to several times.

The 2AR's arguments were primarily focused on a permutation reliant on evidence from Murray. The potential net benefits of the permutation were articulated by the 2ar as disjuncture and 2000 years of history. The 2ar concedes some link arguments most notably the constructive engagement link and the 2nr argument that the 1AR's reference to the K being "utopian" as an independent link.

The best 2nr answer to the permutation and the one that in the end I find the most compelling is that dominant narratives will always overshadow subordinate ones which means the permutation can't put the relevant narratives in the foreground.

Conceptually, the affirmative wins that reflective realism (the perm) is a viable alternative and may often be a superior policy option. However, in this debate the aff does not win that their particular policy option can incorporate this specific criticism. In fact, the 2000 years of history net benefit articulated by the 2ar is in some sense the link to the K. That 2000 years of history is filled with many examples of oppression just like the ones articulated by the negative so the benefit of including that in our policy analysis is dubious at best.

The major weakness of both the 2nr and the 2ar was a lack of impact calculus. As a judge I'm more comfortable deferring to a decision calculus provided by either the 2nr or the 2ar however in this debate I didn't feel either side really did that. Hence, deference to disjuncture or 2000 years of history may seem a reasonable outcome to many although not to me.

In the end the decision is simple. The K links to the plan and to the permutation. The benefits of the permutation don't overwhelm the impacts of the K and so I vote negative.

Mike Hester, State University of West Georgia

I voted aff. as an uber-RFD, I was persuaded that the Murray and Campbell evidence explaining interpretive realism and 'distancing' justified an endorsement of the aff's policy foregrounded by a recognition of cartographical violence, and what the aff refers to as the "permutation"* seems consistent with the following quote from the Shapiro evidence in the C subpoint of the Topographical Amnesia kritik**

THE ALTERNATIVE WORLDS DESTROYED AND SUPPRESSED WITHIN MODERN CARTOGRAPHY BECOME AVAILABLE ONLY WHEN THE GLOBAL MAP IS GIVEN HISTORICAL AND ALTERNATIVE COUNTENANCES.

for me, the aff's advocacy in this round achieves a net beneficial combination of topographical 'remembering' and useful policy recommendation.

specifically, here is how i arrived at my decision. the claims extended in the 2NR do not meet my threshold for what makes a winning argument. there were two links extended: the constructive engagement link and the new 2NC link off of 2AC #6- "our specific solvency evidence is superior." in both instances, Steve claims that these links deny the efficacy of the "perm", responding directly to the 1AR's extension of #6 by extending the 2NC link evidence (Shapiro) and saying "this proves the perm is inauthentic."

but there is not enough direct refutation of the aff's main claim: the Murray/Campbell "perm" combo answers back the link- it is possible to acknowledge the flaws of realism and its map, yet still navigate the terrain successfully. AND it is beneficial to do so-- it allows for case -specific reforms while providing a vehicle for the traveler to break down walls and create new roads for departure. also, both the 2ac/r and the 1ar seem to treat the argument with respect, in a fundamentally different way than the types of IR theory that Shapiro and Der Derrian are deriding. this isn't the stereotypical case of the egotistical driver who refuses to stop and ask for directions.

so, what to do about this question of yes link vs. no, "perm" solves? the problem in crossing this Khyber pass of contention is that both the 2NR and the 2AR refute the claims of the previous speech by simply referring to their own evidence and saying, essentially, "our argument subsumes theirs." the dearth of link/"perm" analysis or impact calculus leaves me left standing in the middle of a crossroads, not sure of which way to go.

using the cards as my compass, i ultimately follow the path illuminated by Emory: awareness of cartographical violence doesn't require a total rejection of realist "solutions", even when those actions are based on a topographically-ignorant bearing. the "risk" that dominant grammars will overcode subaltern discourses is never weighed vs. the benefits of a changing in US policy with Iran. the Campbell and Murray cards delineate the probability that a "rupture" in realism can occur. by being aware of its limits while still working within the context of realist boundarizing, the benefits of particular reforms can be realized while at the same time destabilizing the dominant topo-ideology.

there was definitely room for more in-depth analysis by both teams, which explains why the decision was a 3-2.

* - i use " " when referring to the permutation for two reasons. first, my experience in both judging and coaching folks doing some kritiking leads me to conclude that the legitimacy of "permuting" criticism is still "up for debate." when done in a dynamic form, kritiking seems to make aff claims of "perm-do both" quite the non-sequitur especially when the aff. doesn't DO anything resembling criticism of the nature the NEG is DOING. second, there was not much development of the permutation in this debate. the 2AC was less than comprehensive when mentioning it, and subsequent speeches tended to note it only in brief passing ("extend the perm" or "the perm still links"). this was one of multiple sites of argument where Steve and/or Monick could have exploited what i feel was a general lack of coherent argumentation by Horowitz.

(at this point, i just noticed that I've mentioned every debater by name, except for the 1AR. so, without further ado... ladies and gentlemen, John Paul Lupo. once again,... John Paul Lupo.)

** - i specifically chose to identify the Topographical Amnesia argument as a noun (kritik) rather than a verb infinitive (to kritik). in this round, the argument was underutilized as a dynamic criticism. while there were brief references to sub-national groups (e.g., Native Americans), there was an opportunity to do more. either an archaeological or a genealogical account of the relationships in the region by the 2NC could have been devastating: showing how the line-drawing had not only led to the tensions and conflicts that are noted as "harms" in the 1AC, but also a predictive scenario of how continued deference and reliance on such boundaries doom any attempt to "resolve" these problems. with more of a focus on both highlighting the false boundaries of nation-state building/consolidation, the NEG could have made a persuasive case that there was no "permutation" to be had. any effort by the AFF to "tack on" Steve and Aaron's active criticism onto the "plan" would speak more directly to the type of fallacious IR "footnoting" that the Der Derrian evidence is criticizing. when the square pegs of epistemological or ontological criticisms are forced into the round holes of debate argument formatting, they are more vulnerable to the standard answers used to refute disads and counterplans.

Greg Achten, Pepperdine University

This was one of the finest debates I have seen in many years and I feel that it provides a fitting culmination for the 1999-2000 season as well as the distinguished careers of the four debaters involved. All of these debaters, their coaching staffs, and their programs should be extremely proud.

The negative's sole argument in the 2NR was the Topographic Amnesia kritik. The affirmative responded with several pieces of evidence designed to highlight the flexibility of the realist framework which the 1AC was predicated upon. In the end I was persuaded that the affirmative's permutation offered the best combination of the benefits of enacting a realist policy action, while embracing some or all of the ontology of the kritik.

Specifically, the negative wins several links to the kritik. They win the specific solvency evidence/authors link (i.e. insistence on exemption of affirmative authors allows topographical amnesia) which is the Shapiro evidence read in answer to the affirmative's 2AC #6. The negative also wins the reinforcement of borders via free trade link as argued in answer to 2AC #3, as well as the US Federal Government/agent link (which is also Shapiro evidence). The negative also reads some compelling link evidence in their shell. Specifically, the A subpoint Shapiro evidence explains that invoking the name of a country is equivalent to participation in the strategies and tactics of power that enabled the creation of borders. Further, the B subpoint Shapiro evidence explains that using the language of the prevailing power structure blocks attempts to reconceptualize new alternatives to cartographies.

The affirmative also makes a number of compelling arguments. Specifically the affirmative reads a series of cards that explain the ability of realism to combine with and react positively to criticism. I will discuss each of the pieces of evidence in some detail and explain why I felt they sufficiently answered the kritik. First the affirmative reads a piece of Murray evidence to support their permutation. This evidence explains that the contradiction between the affirmative's realist assumptions and the negative's criticism is actually useful in that it can create a kind of ambiguity and the reflexivity of realism can allow for the creation of a "viable synthesis" of the negative's criticism and the affirmative's policy action. The Guzzini evidence and the Neufield evidence read in the 2AC further support this. The Neufield evidence explains that realism is merely a coping vocabulary and the Guzzini evidence explains that in light of this, realism can be a powerful hermeneutical bridge. Guzzini further explains that rejecting realism outright is a futile enterprise and can at worst cause a repetition of the harms of realism.

The negative makes 2 main answers to the permutation. First they read a piece of Der Derian evidence which describes the permutation as being typical of IR theorists reactions to criticism, which is to footnote the objection and proceed anyway. The second answer is in the form of a piece of Shapiro evidence explaining that placing the dominant discourse of realism in proximity to the negative's critical discourse would allow the dominant discourse to prevail and derail the project of the kritik. In the end I think both of these answers fail. First, the affirmative rightly points out that the

negative's link evidence from the shell (the A subpoint) describes a situation in which people accept present cartographies unreflectively, which is the precise language of the negative evidence. The affirmative then claims that they have in fact been reflective. The affirmative points out that they have taken the kritik very seriously since it was introduced, and that the 1AC does not compromise the entirety of their advocacy. Thus I did not feel that the affirmative participated in the practice of footnoting. Further, I felt that the Murray evidence answered the Shapiro evidence on point. Specifically, the idea that embracing the negative's criticism, while understanding that realism has specific benefits to offer if only in the short term can create a viable synthesis of the kritik and the policy action.

In the end, I feel that the permutation fairly well absorbs the impact of the kritik, while maintaining the efficacy of the plan's action. If there was a flaw in this debate I feel that it was in the lack of impact analysis and evidence comparison in the last two speeches. At the end of the debate, I am unsure of what the harm is to voting affirmative if the negative wins a link to their kritik, but the affirmative wins their permutation. Further, I felt the 2AR did a slightly better job of explaining the warrants of the permutation evidence, specifically the Murray and Neufield cards, although neither the 2NR nor the 2AR spent much time comparing evidence. Ultimately, I felt the quality of the affirmative's evidence in comparing the combination of realism with critical inquiry was superior to the negative's link evidence and permutation answers.

On the whole I found this to be an extremely enjoyable debate and was indeed worthy of being the final round of the NDT. Congratulations again to both teams.

Kelly Dunbar, Baylor University

Congratulations to both teams that participated in the final round- Emory HL and Michigan State DM and to ALL teams that participated in the tournament. I enjoyed judging every round at the tournament and echo the comments of others as to the outstanding competitive quality of the tournament as a whole.

THE DEBATE:

Let me preface my discussion by complimenting the quality of the debate, as I thought both teams did an outstanding job. That being said, however, I found that both the 2AR and the 2NR missed significant opportunities to close off the debate in ways that could have quickly altered the outcome of the decision (and that of other judges I believe.) Most lacking, in my view, was a discussion of the relevant "impacts and implications."

Here's how the debate broke down in my mind...

MSU is clearly winning several persuasive links to the affirmative discourse and plan (which I understand from Emory's perspective is all the better: "the more contradiction the better"- that issue will be assessed on the permutation.)

First, the affirmative's cross-examination "claim of ignorance" as to what Iran meant or was (though it was identified in their plan) was an example par excellence of topographical amnesia- an act of forgetting both the violence bound up with the creation of the nation-state and the marginalized groups that sit at the periphery of the international nation-state system. Initially, I found Emory's refusal to answer such questions helpful for their cause- as the debate developed, however, I felt MSU argued THIS WAS THE ACT OF FORGETTING under criticism and also will lend credibility to the foregrounding discussion later on.

Second, I didn't find the 2AR response of "no, we are serious" to the 2NR arguments that the "alternative=utopian" argument made by the affirmative demonstrated the lack of sincerity of the affirmatives permutation claim. While this type of discursive argument is difficult to fit into the context of the permutation evidence being read- it seemed to demonstrate that perhaps dominant international discourses do in fact try to footnote radical criticism (in a flanking maneuver) and return to "business as usual." Perhaps this type of discursive link is answered by the affirmative "our advocacy is not fixed to the 1AC argument" (which I don't think was ever answered on point by MSU)- however, that argument is not applied to this link argument or the cross-examination link argument- at least according to my flow :)

Most judges (according to my understanding of the after round discussion) agreed on the question of MSU winning "links" to the plan- the real controversy was centered around the permutation/implications. For clarity's sake, I will first try and discuss each individually and then assess the synergy of the permutation/implication arguments.

Emory wins the "idea" of the permutation is a good idea, in that it is possible to consider contradictory discourses simultaneously and perhaps better to do so in that action creates the possibility of a bridge between theory and practice and better ruptures dominant canons by highlighting contradictions and using those inconsistencies as a platform for (re)construction or (de)territorialization. In my mind, however, the negative wins that the assumptions underpinning the warrants in the Murray evidence- i.e. that both systems of thought CAN be placed on an equal pedestal next to one another- IS the problem of dominant international relation/geo-political thinking. The conceptual framework presented by Emory is very persuasive- the feasibility or workability (sounds funny using old school high school terms) of that permutation is greatly called into question by the footnoting and over-coding evidence provided by MSU. While I found Emory's argument that many of Michigan state's cards assumed "uncritical acceptance, unreflective use of" geopolitical thinking- other evidence could not be swept under that argumentative label.

First, the over-coding evidence speaks to the need to distance ourselves from the notion of the "state" in international relations. This evidence worked well- I thought- with Donald's 2NR argument that viewed from the affirmative lens those people who count as "valuable" under current geo-political constructions are those that ascribe themselves to the nation-state. I'm not sure how the permutation avoids such a dominance. In addition, this evidence makes a fairly persuasive argument that critical distance is important. While Emory's Campbell evidence has the potential to answer this argument- I'm not persuaded as to how the discourse and practice of geo-politics can be challenged by accepting or assigning any legitimacy to it... i.e. in terms of the affirmative argument "there is still some reason to vote affirmative" claims... This evidence seems to say we have to begin from a position of total non-alliance with current geo-political boundaries in order to achieve effectively the alternative of deterritorialization.

Second, the footnoting evidence discussed above lends credence to the 2NR argument on the permutation that the desire to achieve the theoretical value of the contradiction will be lost by the controlling nature of current geo-political thought. Again, I think has the 2AR stopped and explained more persuasively here some of the warrants for why and more importantly HOW contradictions can achieve rupture and serve as a hermeneutic bridge I would have voted affirmative. It seemed, however, that the permutation was merely the ploy dominant international thinking uses to continue its hegemony and silencing of alternatives like deterritorialization- all under the guise of being open and honest to alternative perspectives.

Even with the permutation debate as I evaluated it, Emory still had the potential to win my ballot in terms of assessing the implications of voting negative or affirmative and the ultimate consequences of our refusal to engage current geo-political constructions of the world. While the 2AR came close with arguments like "we can't just ignore 2,000 years of foreign policy" and the kritik would be like "saying we can't take a stand against Hitler" I felt that there was an inadequate assessment of the "pragmatic" value of voting affirmative. While the 2NR misses opportunities to argue how the case implicates the solvency or framework of the affirmative harms claims, I do think two 2NR arguments are important:

(1) Identity destruction- as referenced above the beginning on the 2NR on the kritik is a development of the argument that under the affirmative framework "who counts as important", "what conflicts count as valuable and worthy of attention" are always assigned and tightly coupled to the current violent topography of the globe- if you fall outside those boundaries your are ignored. Geo-politics then is not innocent- but an active writing of those violent borders. This does seem to cast doubt on the "pragmatic" constructions of the world offered by the affirmative.

(2) Boundaries as the root cause of conflict- neither side really spends enough time assessing the implications of this argument in the last rebuttals. The 2AR, however, fails to take the opportunity to point to "causes" of the conflicts identified by the 1AC as NOT being related to borders. The 2NR does argue that current borders are the central factor motivating conflict.

Had the 2AR done more to describe what the "pragmatic" benefits of voting affirmative were, I wouldn't have found these arguments to be round winners given the lack of 2NR development. As the debate went down, however, the negative in my mind is getting away with some blanket generalizations about the nature of conflicts that are questionable. The efficiency of the alternative MSU presented was never really contested by the 2AR. Which means when I decide the permutation isn't feasible (in terms of footnoting and over-coding), the question to assess is the value of voting to vote to lift sanctions on Iran or voting for the negative alternative. The "solvency" of either of these approaches is never really contested by the end... why vote affirmative? why vote negative? In mind the 2AR "impact" comparison is done from a world in which the permutation is being won. Without the permutation.... Emory by the end is providing few reasons (if any to vote affirmative.) How does amnesia and topographical violence (including "United States" link and impact argument) weigh against a collapse of stability in Central Asia. That doesn't seem to be discussed much. When Emory has conceded the viability of the alternative and adopted a "we can do that too" approach... and conceded borders are the root of all conflicts... in my mind the "impact" evaluation goes negative even from a purely "realist" logic.

Let me add at this point, I thought the depth of negative link explanation could have been much greater: talking about the history of Iran, the often violent assimilation of Persian and Arab and Jewish and Christian communities after the fall of the Ottoman empire in to the nation of "Iran"- emphasizing the specific nature of the violence implicit and explicit in the boundaries of the so called Middle East. For all the talk of foregrounding, I thought the negative should have taken the affirmative's claim of ignorance further by engaging in the recovery of those voices that history has forgot- as the negative's own evidence describes.

At the end of the debate, I was left to do too much piecing together of the puzzle. I thought both sides were EXCELLENT at packaging and explaining their arguments- but there needed to be more specific application and specific discussions to the opponents evidence and arguments. I thought the 2AR was great in general- especially at describing the value of interpretive realism. More discussion, however, of the feasibility of that permutation (either theoretically or practically) was necessary.

Again congratulations to all competitors at the NDT and CEDA nationals. I will miss the chance to judge Emory HL and MSU DM in the future- two great teams, each worthy of the title NDT champions. Good luck to all in the future and thanks for the allowing me the opportunity to judge the final round...

Colin Kahl - University of Michigan

I thought this year's NDT final round, pitting Emory HL (Aff) against Michigan State DM (Neg), was excellent and a fitting way to end the season.

The final round came down to a single issue: the "Topographic Amnesia" (or "Borders") kritik. I ultimately voted Aff. Here is how my decision broke down.

THE LINK: I thought MSU won a number of clear links to the plan/1AC advocacy. The language and action called for by the Aff, including constructive engagement and the "policing" of borders by the WTO, all linked to the kritik. In addition, the Aff's claim to have specific solvency ended up providing a link based on their "assumption that the observer could stand above the discursive field." Indeed, by the 2AR, the Aff wasn't even contesting most of the links to their plan, and in the absence of a persuasive permutation Emory would have been in trouble. The Aff did do a good job, however, of noting that the Neg's Shapiro evidence seemed to be criticizing an "unreflexive" assumption of borders rather than any discourse referencing borders. This was somewhat important to me because it helped the Aff in the permutation debate, which was one of two ways Emory defeated the kritik.

THE PERMUTATION: Several pieces of evidence read by the Aff were essential to resolving the permutation debate. I felt a number of the warrants in this evidence went unaddressed by MSU and were extended and explained in Emory's rebuttals.

THE MURRAY EVIDENCE: This evidence was a big part of the 2AR. Murray argues that it is possible to act within a state-centric Realist framework and simultaneously criticize that framework. This seems to be powerful defense against the link. Moreover, Murray argues that combining the Aff's advocacy and the kritik is net beneficial on two important levels. First, doing so captures the benefits of the case (something the kritik alone doesn't do, in my opinion-see below). Second, the permutation highlights inherent contradictions that are essential to create a rupture, opening up the possibility for displacing the dominant state-centric discourses the kritik is criticizing. I believed this directly answered the Neg's "foregrounding" argument.

THE CAMPBELL EVIDENCE: This piece of evidence read by the Aff was also important. It indicates that it is beneficial to point in both the pragmatic direction of the plan and in the opposite, more radical direction endorsed by the kritik. Campbell says this allows "distance" from the dominant discourse (explicitly capturing the kritik's impact warrant), forces a rupture in the dominant approach, and simultaneously allows for pragmatic action to address pressing problems in the interim. This reinforces the arguments made by Murray and supports the Aff's claim that the permutation is net beneficial.

THE GUZZINI EVIDENCE: This evidence speaks to the feasibility of using state-centered Realism as a bridge to a criticism of Realism AND says that doing so is on balance better than outright rejection. I felt this answered, and potentially turned, the "footnoting" and co-optation arguments made by MSU against the permutation.

THE NEUFIELD EVIDENCE: This evidence could have been damaging to the Aff. On the one hand, it did say that Realism was just a "coping language," not a set of naturalized assumptions, which helps that Aff's permutation argument. On the other hand, the evidence also says this coping language is vital to advancing and "managing" the project of "state and nation building" which clearly feeds the link. MSU should've picked up on this. However, even if they had, they would still have had to answer the argument that the contradiction between Realism and the kritik is essential to creating a rupture, which is the argument made by Murray and Campbell.

I thought MSU should've done a better job attacking the specific warrants in Emory's evidence. Instead, the Neg relied mainly on two pieces of evidence to answer the permutation. Here's how I evaluated that evidence.

THE DER DERIAN EVIDENCE: This evidence is critical of the tendency for Realist IR scholars to give lip service to criticism, "footnote" it, and move on without changing. I thought this failed to beat the permutation for two reasons. First, I'm not sure the Aff themselves ever treated the kritik as

a mere footnote in any of their speeches. Emory appeared to take the kritik seriously from the beginning. The permutation was always part of a genuine and legitimately "evolving advocacy" (an argument the Neg never answered). Second, Emory's permutation evidence itself doesn't engage in the practices Der Derian is criticizing. The evidence seems to take the kritik seriously and provide a method of advancing it rather than moving on with business as usual.

THE SHAPIRO "DOMINANT DISCOURSES" EVIDENCE. This piece of Shapiro evidence notes the tendency of dominant discourses to "overcode" the kritik of borders. This evidence was pretty good, but there were a few problems with it. First, a "tendency" is not a 100 percent guarantee that the kritik will be co-opted if I vote for the permutation. This is especially the case given the Aff's Murray and Campbell evidence which says that a rupture will be forced by the permutation, not co-optation. Granted, this evidence is less specific to the kritik of borders, but the Neg never emphasized that distinction and I'm not sure why it is relevant in the absence of a good argument by the Neg. Second, the Guzzini evidence is more comparative in its evaluation of the effect of the permutation, suggesting that blanket rejection of Realism is on balance worse for displacing it as a dominant discourse. Finally, the Shapiro evidence doesn't deny the pragmatic value inherent in the permutation's immediate call for action via the plan.

Ultimately, I think the permutation provides a hefty amount of "defense" against the link. It may also provide some "offense" in the sense that the permutation may cause a rupture. This offense may not be very unique, however, since voting for the kritik also moves us away from state-centric Realism. For me, the more important aspect of the permutation was that it gutted most of the link and had a net benefit of insuring the pragmatic action of plan. Which brings me to the impact debate and the second reason I voted Aff.

THE IMPACT: It is often difficult for Affs to outweigh a kritik because of the way kritiks tend to rig the impact comparison. Often, the Neg will win that ontology is all that matters, which means that the Aff's solvency and impacts are never evaluated because they rest on flawed assumptions and have no inherent value; or the Neg will win that the impacts of the case are completely inevitable, creating a "try or die" reason to vote for the kritik; or the Neg will win that the kritik's alternative completely solves the case while avoiding any risk of linking back to the kritik.

I don't think MSU succeeded in rigging the impact comparison in a way that insulated them from the 2AR's argument that state-based action was "good in this instance" and the Aff's evidence defending the desirability of pragmatic action in the interim period of tearing down the dominant Realist discourse.

ONTOLOGY: By the 2NR, the Neg is not really going for a strong "ontology comes first" claim. Instead, the 2NR is critiquing the effects of the Aff's discourse, turning the kritik into a disad of sorts. There is also no strong 2NR claim that the Aff's harms had no inherent value or that their solvency claims were meaningless because they were embedded in the set of assumption the kritik was attacking. The closest the Neg comes is a piece of Shapiro evidence not extended in the 2NR that says action within a state-centered framework props up status quo interests. This, however, does not indicate that there is no value to the Aff's pragmatic action.

THE VIOLENCE IMPACT: The Neg's impact cards say that the assumption of borders is complicit with violence against indigenous peoples. This evidence is excellent, but does not provide compelling reasons to conclude that the kritik outweighs the Aff. First, the impact evidence does not say that the assumption of borders is the root of ALL violence, which would create a try or die scenario. Second, since the impact evidence is specific to the effects on indigenous peoples and there is no decision rule evidence read on the obligation to respect indigenous cultures, it's not clear why the increment of impact arguably adhering to the Aff outweighs the Aff's pragmatic value (i.e. their advantages).

THE ALTERNATIVE: If the Neg had won that the kritik's alternative completely solved the case, I might have voted Negative on the risk that the permutation still linked back to the kritik. But, I don't think the Neg's alternative evidence articulates why "deterritorialization" would solve back anything but the marginalization of indigenous peoples. The evidence certainly doesn't speak to solving anything like the Aff's advantages and the 2NR doesn't even make this claim.

RFD: Ultimately, I thought the pragmatic value of the permutation outweighed the possible increment of link to the permutation. This was a difficult conclusion to make given that I think impact comparison was poor in both the 2NR and 2AR. The 2NR didn't do enough work explaining why the kritik came first, outweighed, solved back the whole case, etc. The 2AR also missed a golden opportunity to stand up and declare that the kritik had, by the 2NR, become a disad with a discourse link and an impact that didn't come close to outweighing the multiple scenarios for global war dropped on the case (wars that would certainly devastate indigenous peoples and lots of others). The absence of this explicit impact comparison forced all the judges to go into the evidence and draw their own conclusions. In the end, I felt that the 2AR's argument that state action was good "in this instance" in combination with the warrants in the permutation evidence meant the Aff's advantages were still in play. Thus, the net benefit to the permutation outweighed a very small risk of the permutation linking to the kritik.

I want to congratulate both teams. The 2000 NDT was clearly among the most competitive ever held; going in, as many as a dozen teams had a good shot to win the tournament. Because of this, I think the two teams reaching the finals should feel a particular sense of pride in rising to the top. I want to congratulate Donald and Monick on an outstanding second semester, concluded by reaching the finals of both CEDA nationals and the NDT. This is something that no other team in history has accomplished and I'm confident they'll be remembered for that achievement, in addition to being such great debaters. Finally, my hat goes off not only to Horowitz and Lupo, who had a great year and a terrific NDT, but to the entire Emory squad. Never before has a single squad fielded three teams of the caliber of the three top Emory teams. In a season where no single team dominated, Emory University still stood head and shoulders above every other debate program. It was thus probably fitting that the national championship would make its way to Athens.

Return to [NDT](#) homepage