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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Debate, argumentation, and discussion are integral parts of the American system of decision making. In Congress, bills are discussed, debated, amended, submitted for vote, and sent to the President. The President may then accept the bill and sign it into law or reject it through veto power. President John F. Kennedy recognized the value of debate in promoting rational decision making after the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba. One historian argues that Kennedy encouraged open debate and discussion in his Cabinet during the Cuban Missile Crisis because he realized the importance of that process in reaching rational decisions (Schlesinger 215). Indeed, debate is a process that encourages rational evaluation of ideas based on evidence and reasoning rather than emotion and whim. Debate as rational decision making permeates all of society, but especially the three branches of government. Freeley writes:

As debate specifically provides reasoned arguments for and against a given proposition, it also provides opportunities for reasoned judgment. Society, as well as the individual, must have an
effective method of reaching reasoned decisions. A free society is so structured that many of its decisions are reached through debate. Our law courts and our legislative bodies are specifically designed to create and perpetuate debate as the method of reaching decisions (2). Thus, debate and discussion serve as the means for making reasoned decisions. It is important, then, for citizens to be aware of the principles of argumentation and debate, not just to facilitate rational governmental decision making, but individual decision making as well.

In this process of rational decision making, the benefits and drawbacks of various forms of action are explored. If problems that need immediate attention exist in society, debate and discussion can suggest solutions to those problems and explore the merits of each specific solution. Often, more than one solution is offered. It is not uncommon, for example, for a member of Congress or an advisor to the President to recommend that a certain policy should not be implemented. That advisor may offer, in its place, a counterproposal that should be considered. In debating the plight of the American farmer, for example, one may suggest that an improved price support system is a solution to the problems of agriculture. But another may suggest that a better solution to the problem is to restrict agricultural imports to allow farmers a larger share of the
American market. This process of debating proposal and
counterproposal is not only popular in government; it is
becoming increasingly popular in academic debate at the
intercollegiate level.

The use of the negative strategy known as the
counterplan has grown significantly in recent years. In a
policy debate, the affirmative team demonstrates a need for
change from the present system, or status quo, and presents
a specific plan that will alleviate the need and solve the
problems isolated. According to traditional debate theory,
the negative team can choose to demonstrate that there is no
need for change by defending the status quo, or present a
counterplan that it argues is a better solution to the need
isolated by the affirmative team. At the present time,
however, many negative teams choose to take a more radical
approach to the counterplan. More negative debaters are
advocating counterplans that call for a change in the system
of government in the United States. Socialism, anarchy, and
world government are proposed by many negative teams as
better solutions to the problems of the world than the
specific affirmative plan.

As expected, the debate community is searching for a
way to deal with this new genre of counterplans.
Affirmative teams search for arguments against socialism and
anarchy, and judges and coaches in academic debate search
for ways to evaluate these "counter-system" counterplans in
Questions arise concerning whether these arguments serve the purpose of promoting rational decision making through debate. Some members of the debate community argue that counter-system counterplans are designed to avoid substantive argumentation on the debate proposition. Others argue that these positions give the negative team an unfair advantage in a debate, since the evidence presented in support of the counterplan is utopian in nature and does not assume real world reactions to such a proposal. Another question that surfaces with regard to counter-system counterplans concerns whether or not they are competitive with affirmative plans. Debate theory holds that counterplans must compete with the affirmative plan. Notions regarding what constitutes competitiveness have changed over the years. But, in general, it is believed by most debaters and coaches that the critic must be forced to choose between the plan and the counterplan at the end of the debate.

In most intercollegiate debate rounds, it is argued that there are five ways the judge can determine if such a choice is required. First, if it is physically impossible to adopt both plans, they are said to be mutually exclusive, and thus competitive. Second, if adoption of both plans, though physically possible, is less desirable than adoption of the counterplan alone, the counterplan is competitive. This is known as the net benefits standard. Third, if the
two plans are philosophically opposed, they are said to be competitive. Fourth, if adoption of both plans would be redundant (solve the same problem) they are competitive. Fifth, if the counterplan precludes adoption of the broader debate resolution, it is competitive with the affirmative resolution, and therefore the affirmative plan. The current controversy surrounding these new counterplans involves whether or not they truly compete with any affirmative plan. Some argue that these counterplans are artificially competitive because they simply abolish the current governmental system that is assumed in the debate proposition. It is the purpose of this study to attempt to resolve the questions surrounding the competitiveness of counter-system counterplans.

Statement of the Problem

Allen J. Lichtman and Daniel M. Rohrer write that "Unfortunately, formal debate theory tends to lag behind the actual practice of competitive debate" (70). This statement accurately describes the current controversy surrounding the counter-system counterplans and how they may affect traditional debate theory. These counterplans are increasingly employed by negative teams in intercollegiate debate, but so far, there is no contemporary attempt to explain how they fit into current debate theory. This study will analyze this new genre of counterplans by answering the following questions.
1. Do counter-system counterplans meet the "traditional" standards of competitiveness? In other words, do they force the judge to choose between two plans, and, in addition, do they solve the harm discussed by the affirmative team?

2. Do the counter-system counterplans meet the "contemporary" standards of competitiveness frequently used by debaters in debate rounds? In other words, are they mutually exclusive, net beneficial, philosophically opposed or redundant with affirmative plans or competitive with the resolution as a whole?

3. Are new standards of competitiveness or modifications of old standards needed to clarify the role of these new counterplans in debate, and if so, what are they?

By answering these questions, this study will discover the problems, if any, that exist with current competitiveness standards and propose alterations in them to help meet the dynamic changes in debate that are taking place.

Significance of the Study

The study of these new counterplans is needed for several reasons. First, the changes in negative strategies actually employed in debate rounds frequently outpace the development of theoretical backing to support those changes. In order for debate to be truly educational, debaters and coaches need to know the theoretical underpinnings of their
strategic choices, arguments and decisions. This study will provide such a theoretical background for the new generation of counterplans.

Second, this study will provide some focus for the debate over counter-system counterplans. Currently in the debate community, discussions about these new strategies abound, but they consist mainly of arguments about the relative "fairness" or "unfairness" of the strategy. By focusing on the issue of competitiveness, this study can provide clear criteria by which to judge the counterplans. In this way, the issue of "fairness" can be addressed in a more coherent and rational fashion.

Third, the study will reevaluate traditional and contemporary competitiveness standards. Debate theory, like any good theory, should be dynamic rather than static. If the study sheds new light on traditional counterplan theory, it will have served its purpose. Thus, the study will review competitiveness standards and offer alterations or alternative standards to allow debate theory to keep pace with debate practice.

Scope of the Study
For the purposes of manageability, this study is concerned only with the issue of competitiveness of the counter-system counterplans. Even though debate theory requires that counterplans be outside the scope of the resolution (non-topical) as well as competitive with the
affirmative proposal, this study is concerned only with competitiveness. The issue of non-topicality of these counterplans is mentioned to clarify certain standards of competitiveness, but non-topicality is not the focus of the study. In addition, no direct attempt is made to determine whether or not these new counterplans constitute "fair" or "unfair" strategies. Perhaps focusing on the issue of competitiveness may persuade the reader that these strategies place an unfair burden on the affirmative team; but the study itself does not evaluate the fairness of the strategy. That judgment should be made by the debater or the debate critic. In addition, the study focuses only upon the counter-system counterplans, rather than all types of counterplans. Although the ideas discussed in the study may be applied to all types of counterplans, the study itself focuses only on the new genre of counterplans: socialism, anarchy, and world government.

Review of Literature

Unfortunately, even a very thorough review of the literature regarding counterplan theory reveals little research on the subject. Most debate textbooks devote little more than one page to the strategy of the negative counterplan, and some devote only a paragraph or two. No doctoral dissertations or master's theses are written on the subject, and only a few journals in the field of communication publish articles in this area. However, a
review of what literature does exist reveals the changes in counterplan theory over the years.

Books

There are many books written on debate theory and practices. However, as mentioned above, little time and effort is devoted to counterplans in these works. The books reviewed for this study are those that contain sections about negative counterplans; books not dealing with that subject are not reviewed.

Early books about debate seem to deal with the counterplan on a rather superficial level. Most books reviewed advise the negative team to avoid the strategy because of the risks involved (Nichols 154; Rowland and Eubank 61-80). Since the strategy is not advised, it is not carefully explained or analyzed. In general, the early books agree that the negative counterplan should solve the need isolated by the affirmative team. William D. Brooks writes:

With a counterplan case, the negative assumes a burden of proving that the counterplan would not only solve the problems presented by the affirmative in their need arguments but would also be a better solution than that proposed by the affirmative (51).

Wood, in his work, agrees:

The negative team admits that the affirmative's
analysis of the problem in the status quo is correct. It submits, however, that the affirmative proposal, as implied by the proposition, is not the best method for correcting the difficulties in the present system. Instead, the negative's counterplan is the best - and only - way to remedy the evils (28).

Several other early books on debate, however, go beyond the issue of meeting the need of the affirmative team. Some argue that the counterplan must exclude adoption of the affirmative plan, as well as meet the need. Nichols writes that the counterplan must not only meet its burdens of proof, but it must also exclude the affirmative proposal; that is, it must not allow the affirmative to accept it and urge adoption of their proposal in addition (154). Behl writes that the new plan must be "essentially different" from the affirmative plan and from the status quo in order to be acceptable (253). Rowland and Eubank argue that the counterplan must be "truly counter," and not just slightly different from the affirmative plan (73). Thompson writes that the negative counterplan must be "vitally inconsistent" with the affirmative plan (91). Thus, in the past, there was a movement to judge counterplans based on how different they were from the affirmative plan and the status quo. Clearly, this was an early attempt to define what is now known as competitiveness; whether or not the two plans could
or should coexist.

Early debate books lay the groundwork for a theory of competitiveness. More "modern" works use these ideas as building blocks for setting up criteria by which to judge the competitiveness of a counterplan. In a work appearing in a collection of articles on debate theory, Ziegler argues that in order to be competitive, the counterplan must achieve the affirmative advantage (solve the harms), and must be mutually exclusive (161). In other words, if the counterplan and the plan can simultaneously coexist the counterplan should be rejected as non-competitive. In another article, Trianosky proposes three standards that counterplans should meet in order to be competitive: they must be structurally competitive (mutually exclusive), philosophically competitive, or functionally competitive, or achieve the affirmative advantages (165-67). Other writers agree basically with this view of competitiveness (Ziegelmueller and Dause; Freeley).

Thus, books in this area give the readers a basic background in the area of counterplan competitiveness. But there is no real attempt to go into much detail; counterplans are considered very superficially in these books.

Journal Articles

Journal articles provide much more in-depth analysis about counterplans and standards for competitiveness. Once
again, early articles argue that the counterplan needs to be different from the affirmative plan, and yet meet the need isolated by the affirmative (Lambertson 48-52; Nebergall 217-220). More recent articles refine competitiveness theory, and develop standards for competitiveness. Lichtman and Rohrer's landmark article on counterplans still provides the dominant criteria used for judging competitiveness. They argue that a counterplan is competitive only if it is mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan, or if it is "net beneficial" over the affirmative plan (75). That is, if adoption of the plan and the counterplan together is less desirable than adoption of the counterplan alone, the counterplan is competitive. This new look at counterplans encourages variations on these standards. Kaplow argues that the affirmative should theoretically propose to allow certain portions of the counterplan to be incorporated into its own proposal, if those portions are not competitive with the plan (218). This proposal is known in the debate community as "permutations." The judge is encouraged to examine specific permutations of the affirmative plan and negative plan to maximize the benefits of both. In addition, Kaplow argues that the counterplan can only claim advantages that are competitive with the affirmative plan. He writes:

Suppose that the negative defends a position similar to the affirmative plan except for one
feature and adds other counterplan provisions unrelated to the resolution. . . . At another extreme, suppose the negative ignores the affirmative and simply presents some proposal unrelated to the topic. Neither counterplan is relevant to a decision over the merits of the resolution. . . . The counterplan advantages are, in short, not "competitive" with the advantages claimed by the affirmative (217).

Here, another innovation is added to counterplan theory. Counterplans that are "extra-competitive" should not be considered by the judge as viable counterplans. This newest innovation is currently being accepted by debaters, and it is argued quite often in debate rounds.

Thus, journal articles in this area are built upon the groundwork laid by early books in debate. Standards for competitiveness are developed, modified, and refined to provide concrete guidelines for critics to use when judging debates in which counterplans are employed.

**Convention and Conference Papers**

As is true in most disciplines, much of the theorizing about argumentation and debate takes place at conferences and conventions through unpublished or soon to be published papers. In terms of counterplan competitiveness, there are a few relevant works to be considered for this study. Solum, in a paper presented to the Western Forensic
Association in 1977, argues that new innovations in counterplan theory should not be discouraged. He writes:

Critic-judges should be encouraged to listen carefully for the reasons advanced for the legitimacy of new forms of the counterplan. Exclusion of a form of argument because of theoretical preconception does not allow the forensic laboratory to achieve its full potential (21).

Solum thereby encourages debate theoreticians to be unafraid of innovation and to avoid blindly rejecting change in counterplan strategies. He seems to encourage a breaking away from the strict standards used in judging competitiveness, and calls for modification of debate theory to account for changes in the practices of debate.

Other writers also call for modifications in currently held standards and criteria for competitiveness. Gossett argues in a paper presented at the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation, that the Lichtman and Rohrer standard of mutual exclusivity should be modified to call for increased argumentation against the specific affirmative harm area (574). Clearly, there is a trend away from blind acceptance of the Lichtman and Rohrer standards of competitiveness. Scholars in the field are searching for ways to improve upon the established means of judging counterplans.

One area of the literature relevant to this study was
clearly missing. No works devoted to discussing counter-system counterplans were discovered in the review of literature. The issues involved in this particular study have been discussed orally, for example at the Owen L. Coon Debate Forum at Northwestern University in February, 1984. However, no written works have appeared in scholarly journals or books on this subject. Thus, this study is the first written attempt to synthesize the issues involved in the controversy and come to some conclusions about the competitiveness of counter-system counterplans.

Methodology

It seems that there is no particular method established by the scholars in the field to study a new innovation in debate theory such as this one. No specific criteria for a study of this kind are established. Therefore, this writer has developed a framework for analyzing the issues based on past knowledge of debate practices and observation of several debate rounds where these strategies were employed. There are four steps that this study will follow to reach its conclusions.

Step one is to trace the development of counterplan competitiveness theory. This will involve a process of first reviewing the literature chronologically and identifying the general theoretical underpinnings for counterplans and specific landmarks in the dominant views of counterplan competitiveness. Then, the specific criteria
that have been proposed over time to judge competitiveness (mutual exclusivity, net benefits, philosophical competitiveness, et cetera) will be reviewed and evaluated. It is necessary to trace general theoretical bases for counterplan debating first, because specific criteria and argumentative strategies arise as a result of general theory. It is necessary then to evaluate specific criteria because those criteria are actually used in debate rounds to evaluate counterplans. In addition, it is reasonable to assume that debaters and coaches utilize these specific criteria to test their new counterplans before they are actually argued in a debate round. Thus, the first step of the study will virtually recreate the thought process that debaters and coaches use in formulating these theoretical arguments.

The second step involves examining the counter-system counterplans themselves. This part of the study will describe and discuss the issues involved in socialism, anarchy, and world government as they are argued in debate rounds. This will involve a discussion of two aspects of these arguments. First, the study will examine how the counterplans are justified as competitive by negative teams. The arguments actually used by advocates of these counterplans will be described and analyzed, including how they utilize specific criteria for competitiveness to justify their positions. Second, the "substantive"
arguments used to justify these counterplans will be reviewed. In other words, what are the benefits of socialism, anarchy, and world government that the negative team would use to justify adoption of the counterplan. In this way, the second stage of the study will be an in-depth analysis of the theoretical and substantive arguments the negative advances in defense of their position. This step is necessary in order to make a rational decision regarding the competitiveness of counter-system counterplans. It is vital to clearly understand the negative positions before constructive criticism of them takes place.

The third stage of the study is a synthesis of the first two steps. Specifically, this portion of the study will attempt to fit the negative justifications for counter-system counterplans into the theoretical framework and criteria for competitiveness examined in step one. To do this, the study will spell out each of the criteria for competitiveness and attempt to fit the counter-system counterplans into them. In essence, this will involve conducting a debate round in print; advancing the negative arguments in favor of the competitiveness of the counterplans, and advancing the affirmative arguments against competitiveness of the counterplans. Through this dialectic, conclusions regarding the efficacy of the criteria for judging competitiveness should be found. In addition, this stage of the study will also involve
returning to the more general theoretical framework for counterplans and describing its relationship to counter-system counterplans. In this fashion, it should become clear if a reformulation of traditional debate theory is needed to account for the existence or acceptance of these new innovations. Obviously, step three will compose the bulk of the study. Discerning the applicability of traditional theory and criteria for competitiveness to new innovations in debate is clearly the main focus of this undertaking.

Step four, the final step, will develop new criteria or standards for competitiveness, if indeed they are found to be necessary. To accomplish this formidable task, the findings from step three will be discussed. It if is found that the currently accepted standards for competitiveness are inadequate in explaining affirmative or negative arguments currently used in debate rounds, suggestions will be made for modifications of old standards, or new standards will be offered as a means to clarify the controversy. If it is found, on the other hand, that current standards and criteria are adequate in explaining the arguments, the study will attempt to provide other approaches in arguing the competitiveness issues that will make them more clear to the debaters and the debate critic. In other words, step four will give concrete suggestions to debaters and coaches as to what argumentative strategies should be adopted in rounds.
that involve these counterplans. In addition, the fourth stage of the study will also explain how debate theory in general may need to change to adapt to these new arguments. Questions such as, "is it necessary for a negative counterplan to solve the specific affirmative harm area" will be answered here. Overall, step four will provide new directions for thought and research in the area of counterplan competitiveness in academic debate.

This method of studying the problem is appropriate for several reasons. First, it essentially recreates what actually occurs in debate rounds both orally and in the minds of the debaters and critics. In this way, it will bridge the gap between debate theory and practice. Second, it provides an orderly, systematic way of studying the issues. It sets forth specific criteria for judging the new counterplans and proposes to analyze them in a rational manner. Third, it accounts for both debate theory and debate practice. It not only uses general theoretical principles as a means of judging the counterplans, but also uses the more specific criteria used to justify competitiveness. In this way, it provides a means to modify both general theory and applied theory at the same time.

Plan of Reporting

In this analysis of counterplan competitiveness in academic debate, chapter II will trace the development of counterplan theory. Chapter III will summarize, describe and
explain the counterplans that are growing in popularity in academic debate; those that propose a change in our governmental system to socialism, anarchy, or world government. Chapter IV will analyze the competitiveness of these new counterplans by applying the general theory and specific criteria to the counterplans themselves. Finally, chapter V will propose new standards for competitiveness of counterplans, if needed, or provide modifications of current standards, and provide suggestions for future research.
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CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COUNTERPLAN THEORY

In the government of the United States, especially in the Congress, debates occur almost every day. Issues debated range from those most vital to our nation to those that are more trivial. But in each debate, advocates take positions, argue for their proposals, refute counterproposals and reach compromise. It is obvious that debating proposal and counterproposal is engrained in legislative debate in our democratic system of government. An example will help to illustrate.

A timely controversy facing our nation today involves resolution of the federal budget deficit. Currently, representatives of both major political parties agree that the deficit is dangerously high and something must be done to prevent severe damage to the economy. But members of each political party differ on what is the best solution to the budget crisis. Leaders of the Republican party, including President Reagan, propose a solution to the crisis that involves cuts in domestic spending, but increases in the military budget and cost of living increases for the Social Security system. These advocates argue that domestic spending needs to be cut, and they believe that the private
sector can replace the government in many of these areas by providing aid to the needy. Supporters of President Reagan argue that the private sector can operate the social welfare system more efficiently without reductions in service. In addition, they argue that national security requires that the defense budget remain untouched. They claim that we need to maintain a strong defensive posture to deter attack from aggressors and to give us bargaining leverage in arms control talks in Geneva.

As is to be expected, there are several opponents to President Reagan's budget plan. These legislators agree that there is a problem that needs a solution; however, they disagree with the solution proposed by the Republicans. These people argue for a counterproposal for reducing the federal budget deficit. Leaders in the Democratic party argue that defense spending needs to be cut instead of domestic programs. They believe that we are secure with the weapons we have now and that domestic programs are more important to the citizens of the United States. Their proposal involves trimming the defense budget, while keeping current domestic programs intact.

Still others in the Congress, who agree that there is a problem with the deficit, believe that we should enact a freeze on all spending and allow no new programs to be funded until the crisis is resolved. They claim that there should be no "sacred cows" in the budget proposal, and that
the severity of the crisis demands drastic action.

All three of these groups of people, Reagan supporters, advocates from the Democratic party, and advocates of a freeze on spending, agree that something must be done soon to resolve the deficit issue. All agree, for the most part, that the severe implications of the deficit could be felt in the near future, and that a solution needs to be found. But these three groups disagree on the means by which the nation should attempt to resolve the budget crisis. In this sense, these politicians are debaters utilizing the strategy of the counterplan; arguing for their own solutions to the problem and refuting opponents' plans.

Consequently, legislators, politicians, and even presidents are fond of debate and discussion. Legislative debate is not only common in the United States, but in other democratic nations as well. It is important to understand how academic debate theory reconciles different strategies and their implications for the activity. This portion of the study will briefly describe the burdens of proof of the affirmative and negative teams in an academic debate, survey the options of the negative team in refuting the affirmative proposal, and trace the historical development of the theory of the negative counterplan from its inception to the present time. It is hoped that this will shed some light on the problems created by the counter-system counterplans that are the focus of this study.
In an academic debate, a rather broad topic is chosen each year by participants and coaches. For example, the 1984-85 intercollegiate debate resolution is, Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should significantly increase exploration and/or development of space beyond the Earth's mesosphere. An affirmative team under this resolution argues there is a problem in our current space program. A specific plan is then proposed to resolve the problem. In so doing, the affirmative team's specific plan must fall within the general scope of the debate resolution, or, in other words, the plan must be "topical." An example of a topical plan under this resolution is one that embarks on a program of developing a system of solar power satellites, large orbiting structures that collect energy from the sun in space, and beam the energy back to earth in the form of microwaves that are used to generate electricity. Once an affirmative team has chosen a plan, it must develop a rationale for why that plan should be adopted.

An affirmative team is required to prove that a problem exists in the status quo that the chosen plan will solve. There are three specific areas that the affirmative team must address in proving that this problem exists. First, it must prove that the problem is significant enough to warrant action. For example, a team advocating solar power satellites could argue that our dependence on fossil fuels
(coal and oil) is damaging our environment by producing acid rain and pollution. It must prove that the acid rain and pollution problems are significant enough to call for a major program to decrease their use. Second, the affirmative must prove that the problem is inherent. That is, the affirmative must prove that the present system is incapable of solving the problem. Here, it could argue that the federal government is committed to fossil fuels, and that due to this commitment, the space program ignores the concept of solar power satellites. The affirmative could argue that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is more interested in the Space Shuttle program and military uses of space than in solar power satellites. Third, the affirmative must prove that its specific plan will alleviate these problems. For example, it could claim that solar power satellites are technically feasible and relatively inexpensive, and that their use could replace fossil fuels which would protect our environment from acid rain and pollution.

In this way, the affirmative presents a complete idea for the judge of the debate. There is a problem, it will continue to exist unless action is taken, and there is a proposal to solve that problem. If the affirmative has met all of these "burdens of proof," it has met the requirements for an affirmative case.

The negative team in the debate has several options
when deciding how to argue against the affirmative case. The first strategy is called "straight refutation." In this instance, the negative team addresses all of the "stock issues" in the debate (significance of the problem, inherency, and whether the plan is adequate to solve the problem). For example, a negative team arguing against the solar power satellite concept could claim that the acid rain problem is not significant enough to warrant such a large program. It might argue that more study of the phenomenon is needed, there are natural causes of acid rain, and that acid rain actually increases the productivity of lakes and soil. It might also argue that the present system is studying the concept of solar power satellites or alternative non-polluting sources of energy that will eventually replace fossil fuels. Finally, the negative might argue that solar power satellites are technically not feasible, too expensive, or dangerous to human health. In this way, the negative team attempts to deny the need for change by defending the status quo and attacking the affirmative plan.

A second negative option involves proposing a change that is more minor than the change advocated by the affirmative team. In calling for a "minor repair," the negative team might claim that a better way to solve the acid rain problem would be to grant the Environmental Protection Agency more power to enforce pollution control
laws. In this way, the negative team claims that the affirmative plan is too broad in scope, and that it is not necessary when smaller changes could solve the problem just as easily as the plan.

The final negative option involves proposing a counterplan. This differs from a minor repair in that the negative advocates a change just as major as the affirmative plan as an alternative solution to the problem isolated by the affirmative. A counterplan must meet three burdens in order to be considered legitimate in a debate round. First, it must not fall under the general scope of the debate resolution, or in other words it must be non-topical. For example, a negative team might propose a counterplan that solves the acid rain problem by mandating a shift from fossil fuels to alternative sources of energy that are ground-based and do not require the development of outer space. It might claim that solar panels on houses, wind generators, geothermal energy and other alternatives are viable solutions. Second, if the negative proposes a counterplan, it must prove it to be competitive with the affirmative plan. In other words, adoption of either the affirmative or negative plan should call for rejection of the other. Consequently, the negative counterplan must operate as an alternative to the affirmative plan. The negative team in this case could argue that there are not enough resources in the federal government to allow adoption
of both ground-based alternative energy sources and space-based ones as well. In this case, the two plans would compete with each other, and the judge is required to choose between the two options. Finally, the counterplan must achieve a unique advantage. There is some disagreement over whether or not the counterplan must solve the same problem as the affirmative, or whether it can solve any other problem and still be legitimate. This question will be addressed later. But most theorists agree that there must be some rationale for adopting the counterplan.

The negative team in an academic debate presents a complete idea for the judge to consider. Either the affirmative problem does not warrant immediate action, or other actions could solve the problem more easily. It is important to consider how the strategy of the counterplan has developed over the years. Specifically, this study addresses the issue of competitiveness; what a negative team must do to prove that its counterplan competes with the affirmative proposal. The following portion of the study will trace the historical development of counterplan theory.

1926 to 1960

In studying the history of counterplan theory, there are three periods into which the development can be divided. The first period begins in 1926, and lasts until 1960. The earliest comment on the negative strategy of the counterplan comes from Egbert Ray Nichols in 1926. He writes that the
strategy of the counterplan is "grand larceny" against the affirmative team (xxii). He claims that the strategy deprives the affirmative team of sufficient grounds for argumentation, and that a counterplan should be "looked down upon as contemptible and lacking in the spirit of gameness and fairness" (xxii). Nichols believes that the counterplan is a bad, illegitimate strategy that should be discouraged. This illustrates the state of counterplan theory at this early point in history. There are no major treatises on debate theory written prior to 1926, much less counterplan theory, and the reaction to this new innovation is a negative one. This is not to say that in the 1920's all scholars agree with Nichols' conception of the counterplan strategy. Waldo Willhoft writes in 1929, that the negative team can concede part of the affirmative problem area, and present an alternative plan (138). At this point in the debate, the discussion simply shifts to arguing over the merits of the two plans. However, Willhoft gives no guidance to the teams as to how they should go about debating the merits of the two plans, and how a judge is to decide between the two plans. It is easy to notice the vagueness with which counterplans are treated at this point. In 1930, the beginnings of the notion of competitiveness in counterplan theory arises. Carroll P. Lahman gives some guidance to debaters and judges when he writes in 1930, that the counterplan is acceptable if it is "really counter" to
the affirmative plan (131). This is the inception of the idea of competitiveness; there is a recognition here that the counterplan must not just be different from the affirmative plan, but that it must be counter. Once again, however, there is no guidance given to the debaters or judges as to how to decide if a counterplan is really counter. It is left up to the judge to make a subjective decision about competitiveness at the end of the debate.

A landmark work in the area of counterplan competitiveness appears in 1932. J. M. O'Neill and J. H. McBurney devote several pages to counterplan theory in their book, *The Working Principles of Argumentation*. For the first time, guidelines for debaters and judges are given to help them in arguing or deciding a counterplan debate. O'Neill and McBurney write that there are several questions a debater or judge can ask during a counterplan debate. Among them are, (1) are there other plans which would meet the needs better than the plan proposed in the proposition, (2) do these other plans differ more or less from the present system than the affirmative plan, (3) are these plans counter to the affirmative plan and (4) would such alternative plans give rise to new and greater evils to such an extent to cause them to be impractical (36)? These questions serve as guidelines for debaters attempting to develop a counterplan strategy. This is the first work to propose such a set of questions designed to aid the debater
In addition, O'Neill and McBurney propose some other novel ideas that are now generally agreed to be part of accepted counterplan theory. They argue that the counterplan must "meet the need" of the affirmative plan, or, in other words, solve the same problem the affirmative isolates, and the counterplan must be able to accomplish this task absent the affirmative plan. They write:

> Any legitimate substitute proposal must be one which meets the same situation which the affirmative plan is designed to meet, and at the same time is one which cannot possibly work along with the affirmative plan (40).

This is the first statement of a standard for competitiveness of a counterplan. The two proposals must be "mutually exclusive," or, as O'Neill and McBurney state, they must not be able to work together. The authors continue by stating the conditions under which a counterplan would satisfy the burden of competitiveness. They argue that a counterplan must either be "totally inconsistent, or contain within it certain vital features which are inconsistent with the affirmative proposal" (40). If this standard is not met, they claim that the affirmative can thank the negative team for presenting their counterplan, incorporate it into their own proposal, and explain how the two plans could work together (40). This landmark work
explains the rationale behind why a counterplan must compete with an affirmative plan. If the two plans could exist together, they could provide a good solution to a problem and the judge would not know how to decide between the two plans. Finally, O'Neill and McBurney give advice to debate judges regarding how to evaluate counterplans. The authors claim that a counterplan and plan should be judged based on the "comparative ability to meet existing needs" (39).

O'Neill and McBurney's philosophy of the negative counterplan dominated the field for almost ten years, and in fact, their basic ideas are still widely accepted today. In 1941, Alan Nichols adds some different features to counterplan theory that are worthy of noting. Nichols agrees with O'Neill and McBurney in that the counterplan must exclude the affirmative proposal, but he does not agree that the negative must concede the problem isolated by the affirmative. Nichols claims that the negative may, in the first place, deny the evils of the present system, and then contend that even if they do exist, a counterproposal would be a superior solution (144). This claim allows the negative team much more flexibility in formulating strategy and allows it much more grounds for argumentation against the affirmative case. The negative has the option of simultaneously employing straight refutation and a counterplan. Other writers at this time agree with Nichols (Eubank and Auer 416). During the era, however, there are
no clear standards by which to judge competitiveness of a counterplan. It is agreed that it must be inconsistent with the affirmative proposal, but no writers delineate what would constitute sufficient inconsistency in the two plans. This vagueness is exemplified by several authors in the 1940's and 1950's (Lambertson 51; Behl 247; McBurney and O'Neill 167; Potter 73).

The final achievement in this first historical period that deserves mention is the claim by Nebergall in 1957, that the negative team can lose a counterplan to affirmative argumentation and still win the debate (220). He argues that the negative can choose to argue the affirmative need area and propose a counterplan to meet that need at the same time. He claims that the negative would win either if they won the counterplan, or if they defeat the need for the affirmative plan. Consequently, according to Nebergall, there is great leeway for the negative team if it employs the counterplan strategy.

Therefore, in the period from 1926 to 1960, there are great advances in counterplan theory. Initially, the counterplan is seen as an unfair and illegitimate strategy. There is great bias in the field against this type of argumentation, but it is clear that as the acceptability of counterplans begins to grow, scholars struggle with attempts to clarify the strategy's role in academic debate. At first, vague notions about the burdens of proof of a
counterplan are agreed upon, and later, more specific ideas are stated. However, there is little guidance for the debater or judge of a counterplan to determine if it has met its burdens of proof. Attempts at defining mutual exclusivity are made, but no concrete standards are established. Finally, most early writers agree that the counterplan must meet the need of the affirmative plan, but that the negative still has the option of attacking the need as well as proposing a counterplan.

1960 to 1974

The second historical period in the development of counterplan theory begins in the 1960's and ends in 1974. During this stage, some of the vagueness of the earlier theorists is removed, and one begins to see concrete standards by which to determine if a counterplan is competitive with the affirmative proposal.

In 1966, two books concerning academic debate appeared in which counterplan strategies were treated. In one of these, Bauer perpetuates the vagueness of the earlier days by claiming that the counterplan need only be "clearly different from that of the affirmative" (39). How different the plan and counterplan must be is left up to the judge and the affirmative team to decide. Brooks claims that the counterplan must be "fundamentally inconsistent" with the affirmative plan (51), which is still unclear. However, Brooks identifies a new innovation, or a modification of an
old strategy, by claiming that the negative is not required to admit the need of the affirmative. Rather, he argues that the negative in a counterplan debate may wish to redefine the affirmative need area and claim that the counterplan solves the need better (51). For example, an affirmative team that claims to bring impoverished citizens out of the ranks of the poor by increasing government payments to them assumes that lack of money is the root of their poverty. A negative team could redefine the need by claiming that the root of the problem is a lack of education, and then present a counterplan that educates the poor to bring them out of poverty. This redefinition of need could be strategically wise for a negative team wishing to present a counterplan. Other scholars agree that this is a wise choice for a negative team proposing a counterplan (Wood 29).

In 1968, affirmative teams finally receive concrete advice from scholars about how to defeat a negative counterplan. Roy V. Wood suggests specific ways for affirmative teams to argue counterplans and establishes criteria to determine which plan is the best at solving a given problem. He suggests that affirmative teams should, (1) remain on the offensive by not allowing the negative team to draw them away from their own ground, and (2) compare the plan and the counterplan based on two criteria; which plan best meets the need, and which plan does so in
the most efficient, practical, and workable manner (122-3).
This is the first concrete advice given to affirmative teams concerning counterplans and also the first time specific criteria are provided to help choose between the two proposals for change. This is one attempt to clarify how a judge in a debate would go about choosing one plan over another, and thus is a major step forward in the development of counterplan theory.

In the 1970's, there is an increase in interest surrounding counterplan theory. In 1971, scholars begin to reformulate their ideas about counterplans and how they should be judged in a debate. Wayne Thompson rephrases the early term describing counterplan competitiveness. Instead of the two plans being "vitally inconsistent," it now must be impossible to adopt both the affirmative and the negative plans (91). With this notion, it becomes clear that it is no longer acceptable for a counterplan to be simply inconsistent with the affirmative plan; it must be impossible to have both the affirmative plan and the negative plan existing at the same time. In addition, at this same time, it is argued that the counterplan must indeed be non-topical as well as competitive (Colburn 158). This is the first time that the literature explicitly states that a counterplan is illegitimate if it falls within the boundaries of the resolution. The logic behind this idea is sound; if a counterplan is allowed to be topical, there is
no direct clash in a debate, for both teams would be agreeing that the general proposition should be adopted in some form.

Until 1973, it seems that the use of a counterplan as a negative strategy is only grudgingly tolerated. Some writers in the 1960s even discourage the use of counterplans in academic debate (Colburn 157). However, in 1973, Bernard Brock and others make an impassioned plea for acceptance of counterplans as legitimate negative strategies. In Public Policy Decision Making: Systems Analysis and Comparative Advantage Debate, the practice of systems analysis is borrowed from the social sciences and proposed as a model or paradigm for judging debates. Brock, et. al. argue that counterplans and systems analysis, if employed in debates, will stop abuses of the strategy of minor repairs by the negative team, and improve debate overall. They write:

Debaters currently use status quo revisions to take an ambiguous stand; they equivocate between defending the present system and initiating major modifications which would require them to offer a counterproposal and a meaningful burden of proof (160). The authors claim that an emphasis on policy comparison and systems analysis on the part of the judge in a debate will force the negative to defend a consistent policy (Brock et. al. 161). This in turn, they argue, would strengthen
academic debate. Here, for the first time, one sees full endorsement and encouragement of the strategy of the negative counterplan. The suggestion of the use of systems analysis and policy comparison is reflected quickly in the literature. Other writers agree with the proposal, and encourage counterplans to be argued in order to facilitate such policy analysis (Campbell 139-40).

The last work in this second historical period is one that could be considered a landmark in counterplan theory. Ziegelmueller and Dause establish two criteria by which to judge whether a counterplan competes with an affirmative plan. They claim that the counterplan must be either philosophically different or structurally different from the affirmative plan and the status quo (Ziegelmueller and Dause 178). Here a proposal is made to determine competitiveness based on more objective standards than whether the plans are inconsistent. A judge can look at the structures and see if they could coexist, or he or she can look at the philosophies of the two plans to see if they are consistent. Even though this standard is still relatively vague, it does at least provide some guidelines for judging counterplan competitiveness.

In summary, the second historical period establishes the legitimacy and acceptability of the counterplan as a negative strategy, when debate begins to focus on systems analysis and policy comparison. Some scholars are beginning
to encourage negative teams to use counterplans as a means to improve the quality of academic debate. In addition, more objective standards for judging competitiveness of a counterplan are established, although some subjectivity is still involved in determining whether or not two philosophies are consistent. Finally, there is some guidance for affirmative and negative teams regarding what to argue in debates involving counterplans.

1975 to the Present

The final period in which counterplan theory is developed and refined begins in 1975, and continues to the present. This period is characterized by several landmark articles on counterplan theory and several innovations in affirmative and negative approaches to the counterplan in academic debate. The first work in this period is a collection of articles in debate theory edited by David Thomas. Two of these articles deal with counterplans and how they should be debated by affirmative and negative teams. These articles are significant because for the first time, the word "competitiveness" is used to describe the burden of proof possessed by the negative to show that the counterplan cannot coexist with the affirmative plan. Standards are given to allow negative and affirmative teams, and even judges, to determine if a given counterproposal is competitive. Gregory Trianosky argues that the counterplan is competitive if its adoption logically precludes
simultaneous adoption of the resolution (161). He claims that there are three standards, or types of competitiveness that can be claimed by the negative; philosophical competitiveness, structural competitiveness, or functional competitiveness (165-7). A counterplan is philosophically competitive with an affirmative plan if the philosophy advocated by the negative counterplan is inconsistent with the philosophy advocated by the affirmative plan. For instance, an affirmative plan calling for direct government intervention in the economy to reduce unemployment, and a negative counterplan calling for free market policies to correct the same evil, would be philosophically competitive. The affirmative advocates Keynesian philosophy and the negative advocates laissez faire philosophy. A counterplan is structurally competitive if it is physically or institutionally impossible to adopt both plans. For example, an affirmative plan that advocates building anti-satellite weapons and ballistic missile defense to prevent massive damage to the United States in the event of a nuclear war would compete with a negative counterplan that prohibits the militarization of outer space in an effort to preserve the peace. It would be physically impossible to both have ballistic missile defense and prohibit it at the same time. The third type of competitiveness proposed by Trianosky is functional competitiveness. A negative counterplan is functionally competitive if it achieves the
same advantage as the affirmative plan. It is argued that it is unnecessary to have two plans working to solve the same evil at the same time, and so the judge must choose between the two plans.

At this point, it is easy to see that competitiveness theory is becoming much clearer and specialized. Typologies of competitiveness arise, and it is easier for a judge to determine competitiveness issues in a given round. He or she simply applies a formula based on argumentation in the debate round to determine whether or not the counterplan is competitive. It is precisely at this time that the most influential article on counterplan competitiveness appears. Allan J. Lichtman and Daniel M. Rohrer's article appears in the Fall, 1975 issue of the Journal of the American Forensic Association. This article is the basis for current thought in counterplan theory. Consequently, it deserves special attention.

Lichtman and Rohrer begin their article by claiming that debate is increasingly becoming intertwined with systems analysis and cost benefit analysis. At the end of a debate round, the judge weighs the costs and benefits of each team's proposals, and opts for the more beneficial of the two. Lichtman and Rohrer claim that debate is becoming more sophisticated and akin to real world decision making (1975, 70). But they claim that debate theory has failed to keep up with these major changes. They write,
"Unfortunately, formal debate theory tends to lag behind the actual practice of competitive debate" (1975, 70). This article is an attempt to reconcile debate theory in the area of counterplan competitiveness with actual practice in debate rounds.

Lichtman and Rohrer begin their discussion by summarizing the positions of the early debate theorists. They claim that early works were almost in total agreement that negative counterplans must assume the validity of the affirmative's indictments of the status quo, but propose a different solution (1975, 71). This claim is consistent with this chapter's review of the early works in counterplan theory. Lichtman and Rohrer argue that a view of counterplan theory that incorporates systems analysis and policy comparison needs to be developed to keep debate theory in line with debate practice (1975, 71-2).

In doing this, the authors first claim that systems analysis in the real world is based on probability. They write:

Decision theory stipulates that the net benefits of any policy system are a function of both the probability that the system will achieve results and the value placed upon those results. A rational decision-maker seeks a policy which provides the greatest chance of obtaining the most desirable consequences (1975, 73).
Therefore, the debate judge, being a rational decision maker, should determine which of the two policy choices has the greatest probability of success, and which provides the greatest benefits. Therefore, Lichtman and Rohrer claim that the key to a new theory of the counterplan is the demonstration that a counterplan is not competitive if adoption of both the plan and the counterplan yields greater "net benefits" than adoption of the counterplan alone (1975, 75). If it is more advantageous to adopt the counterplan alone rather than in concert with the affirmative plan, it is competitive. In other words, at the end of a debate round, the judge would weigh the advantages of the counterplan and the affirmative plan against each other to see which is most beneficial, and then consider disadvantages, or drawbacks to either of the plans and "subtract" those drawbacks from the benefits. In this way, the judge determines which plan is most advantageous with the least drawbacks, or in other words, which plan is most "net beneficial." The most net beneficial plan is the one that a rational decision maker would vote for. This is a clear method for a debate judge to use to determine competitiveness of a counterplan. Advantages and disadvantages of both plans are weighed, and the plan that emerges as most net beneficial is the one to be voted for.

Thus, Lichtman and Rohrer claim that a counterplan is competitive if it is either mutually exclusive with the
affirmative plan (Trianosky's structural competitiveness) or if the counterplan is more net beneficial than the affirmative plan (1975, 75). They argue that this view of competitiveness shifts the judge's decision away from the affirmative problem area to the negative policy itself, and allows for a fair test of the negative plan (1975, 75).

Perhaps an example of a net beneficial counterplan would be helpful. If an affirmative argued that we should develop solar power satellites to alleviate our acid rain problem, a net beneficial negative counterplan would be one that imposed ground-based restrictions on sulfur emissions to alleviate the same problem. In this case, the negative would argue that the counterplan avoids the disadvantage of massive federal expenditures needed for solar power satellites, that could plunge the nation into recession due to the increase in the budget deficit. The counterplan would be net beneficial, because it achieves the affirmative advantage (reducing acid rain) while avoiding a disadvantage (increasing the federal deficit). Although the negative counterplan is not required to achieve the affirmative advantage in Lichtman and Rohrer's scheme, it is possible, and probably helpful, for it to do so.

This article by Lichtman and Rohrer represents a massive shift in debate theory. It acknowledges the move away from the problem-solution format of traditional debate and incorporates newer systems analysis into debate theory.
Lichtman and Rohrer state:

This attempt to formulate a new theory of the counterplan based upon a systems model of policy dispute has important implications both for academic debate and the actual formulation of policy. It clarifies the untapped potential of the counterplan for competitive debate, and provides a rational basis for assessing the legitimacy of counterplans (1975, 79).

As is to be expected, this new innovation in debate theory is not without its antagonists. One writer claims that Lichtman and Rohrer's ideas are reducing debate to a game, in which negative teams have the incentive to avoid the affirmative problem area and propose a counterplan to resolve much more difficult and significant problems (Sanders 277). For example, using the net benefits standard, it would be possible for a negative team to claim that money should not be spent on solar power satellites because it could be better spent attempting to alleviate world hunger and overpopulation problems. A negative team could propose a counterplan that feeds the world and claim that it achieves more advantages than the affirmative plan. However, Lichtman and Rohrer respond to this claim by arguing that the new view of counterplans is more akin to the real world, since Congress considers budgetary constraints all the time, and that in traditional debate
theory, the critic compares advantages and disadvantages of the affirmative plan anyway (1978, 238). The use of a counterplan would not change that at all.

Another criticism lodged against Lichtman and Rohrer concerns their assumption that debate is analogous to public policy decision making. Gossett argues that this is not always the case, and in fact, that real world policy constraints do not always operate in the debate world (574). For example, Gossett argues that artificial debate constraints, such as the requirement that counterplans be non-topical, are not analogous to the real world, and therefore, the assumption that all debate is similar to policy making is not entirely valid (574). This statement has bearing on the issue of counterplan competitiveness. Gossett claims that utilizing the net benefits standard could allow for abusive counterplans. He argues that a negative counterplan could propose a change totally unrelated to the affirmative problem area and claim to be competitive by using the funding mechanism found in the affirmative plan and argue that there would not be enough money to fund both plans (574). The solution proposed by Gossett is a sound one: judges in a debate round need to be wary of such counterplans, and require that the counterplan clash with the problem area isolated by the affirmative plan (575). In this way, it is more likely that the debate will focus on the specific affirmative harm area and different
solutions to that problem, rather than focusing on the problem of financial constraints in the governmental system. In general, however, there is little criticism of Lichtman and Rohrer's scheme; it seems to have been accepted by debaters and judges alike as a legitimate and objective way to determine counterplan competitiveness.

Despite attacks from different scholars, debaters and debate judges have adopted Lichtman and Rohrer's standards of competitiveness as legitimate. The net benefits standard is used frequently and is well accepted. It is hailed as a new innovation in debate theory and accomplishes the task of reconciling debate theory with debate practice.

The next work on counterplans is also one that encourages innovation. Solum, in a paper presented to the Western Forensic Association, argues that counterplans are legitimate strategies in debate, and innovation in counterplan practice should be encouraged (21). In a sense, Solum defends Lichtman and Rohrer and calls for increased experimentation in debate. He writes:

Critic-judges should be encouraged to listen carefully for the reasons advanced for the legitimacy of new forms of the counterplan. Exclusion of a form of argument because of theoretical preconceptions does not allow the forensic laboratory to achieve its full potential (21).
In 1981, another landmark article appeared in the *Journal of the American Forensic Association*. In this article, Louis Kaplow attempts to modify counterplan thought to allow affirmative teams to deal effectively with the potential problems inherent in Lichtman and Rohrer's approach. Kaplow argues that an affirmative team can deal with "feed the world" counterplans by arguing that advantages that are unrelated to the debate resolution are "extra-competitive," and should not be considered by the debate judge (217). For example, an affirmative team could claim that solving hunger is unrelated to the resolution that we should increase development of outer space, and as a result, is illegitimate. This is true, Kaplow argues, because a counterplan only serves as a reason to reject the debate resolution as a whole if it is outside of the boundaries of affirmative grounds for argumentation. He writes:

A variety of functions, ranging from continued life (breathing, etc.) to all government action not specifically included in or precluded by the resolution, are common to both affirmative and negative territory. Thus, benefits stemming from elements common to "affirmative land" and "negative land" are not relevant to the choice between territories (217).

Advantages outside the realm of the resolution are common
ground for both the affirmative team and the negative team. Both of these teams can support action that is common to their grounds for argumentation. The practical implication of this is that "feed the world" counterplans are not competitive with an affirmative plan under the outer space resolution, because feeding the world is not prohibited by the resolution. Thus, affirmative teams can "capture" portions of negative counterplans that do not compete.

Kaplow proposes that the affirmative can employ a test to determine the competitiveness of these types of counterplans. The debaters can consider all of the possible permutations of the affirmative plan and portions of the negative plan that are extra-competitive (218). If it is hypothetically possible to combine the essence of both plans to achieve maximum benefits, the counterplan is not competitive (218). This innovation allows the affirmative team to summarily dispose of non-competitive counterplans with the use of this simple test: permutations. Perhaps this concept proposed by Kaplow is a means to correct the potential deficiencies in Lichtman and Rohrer's notion of competitiveness. This idea of permutations is used frequently in academic debate and is becoming accepted as a method to deal with extra-competitive counterplans.

The last major work on counterplan competitiveness appeared in a book published in 1983, by J. W. Patterson and David Zarefsky. The major influence of this book is not
necessarily in counterplan theory, but in defense of a different paradigm for viewing debate. It is argued that debate should not be a comparison of policies, but rather that the resolution is a hypothesis that is to be rigorously tested in the course of the debate round. Therefore, the only burden of the negative team is to cast doubt on the truth of the resolution by proposing non-resolutional alternatives to the affirmative problem. For example, if non-resolutional action such as sulfur emission standards could solve the acid rain problem equally as well as resolutional action such as solar power satellites, the resolution, or hypothesis, is proven untrue. However, this paradigm does not negate the necessity of proving competitiveness of the counterplan proposed by the negative. The counterplan, or counterresolution, must be a substitute for the affirmative plan or resolution.

Patterson and Zarefsky identify what they see as three possible standards of competitiveness. The first is what they call redundancy, or the fact that the counterplan achieves the affirmative advantage. This of course is the traditional view of counterplan competitiveness, for if the judge can solve the affirmative area with the counterplan, it is a good substitute for the affirmative plan. Patterson and Zarefsky argue that this is not an acceptable standard for competitiveness. They claim that many times in the real world, redundancy in policy is a good idea (217). For
example, both the federal government and the state
governments have pollution control laws. Even though these
may be duplicative policies, they ensure that the
environment is kept relatively free from pollution. The
redundancy standard assumes that duplicative actions in a
specific policy realm are undesirable, however this is not
always the case. The second standard of competitiveness
Patterson and Zarefsky consider is mutual exclusivity. They
claim that a legitimately competitive counterplan can "be
incompatible with the resolution, even though it does not
solve the affirmative's problem" (217). An affirmative plan
that calls for increased American independence from the rest
of the world is susceptible to a counterplan that calls for
a world government that would increase the interdependency
of states. Even though this counterplan does not solve the
evils isolated by the affirmative, it is clearly
inconsistent with the affirmative plan, or the resolution
(Patterson and Zarefsky 217). Finally, Patterson and
Zarefsky agree that net benefits is a legitimate standard
for competitiveness of counterplans (217).

Overall, then, this final period in the development of
counterplan theory consists of many changes and innovations.
By this point, counterplans are accepted as legitimate
negative strategies, and many more teams begin to employ
them in debate rounds. In addition, innovation in
developing new types of counterplans is encouraged.
Counterplans are seen as competing policy systems that must be subjected to systems analysis. Finally, one begins to see clear standards and tests for competitiveness of counterplans. Mutual exclusivity, net benefits, philosophical competitiveness, and redundancy are the main standards that emerge. Permutations of affirmative plans and counterplans are used as a test to determine if the counterplan claims an extra-competitive advantage, and thus to determine if the counterplan is legitimately competitive.

At the present time, it is possible to address the question of this study. Are counterplans that change the governmental system truly competitive, or are they merely counterplans that claim extra-competitive advantages? Are these counterplans subject to permutations with the affirmative plan? Before this question is answered, however, it is necessary to review and critique the commonly accepted standards of competitiveness to determine the current state of counterplan theory.

The most common standard of competitiveness, or at least the most traditional one, is that of redundancy. It is widely believed today that if the counterplan achieves the affirmative advantage, it is competitive. Perhaps this belief in redundancy as a good standard is a backlash against the counterplans that some consider abusive; those that feed the world and use the net benefits standard to claim competitiveness. Certainly, if redundancy was the
only acceptable standard for competitiveness, these types of counterplans would not be acceptable. However, it is necessary to keep in mind Patterson and Zarefsky's objections to redundancy as a competitiveness standard. It assumes that duplicative actions designed to achieve the same goal are undesirable. However, this is not always the case. It is safe to conclude that although redundancy may be sufficient for a counterplan to be competitive, it is not necessary. A wise negative strategy is one that develops a counterplan which does achieve the affirmative advantage, or at least part of it, and then continues to develop other arguments such as disadvantages to counteract whatever affirmative advantage is left. In this case, the counterplan serves to minimize affirmative significance to give the disadvantages to the affirmative plan more weight.

The second standard that emerges from this discussion of the historical development of counterplan theory is that of mutual exclusivity. This standard clearly dates back to the beginnings of counterplan theory when writers were urging that counterplans need to be "vitally inconsistent" with affirmative plans. It is safe to say that mutual exclusivity is the most widely accepted standard of competitiveness in academic debate today. If it is physically impossible to adopt both the affirmative and negative plans at the same time, the critic is forced to choose between the two plans, which is the purpose of the
burden of competitiveness. One question that arises, however, is which aspect of the affirmative plan must the counterplan exclude. Is it sufficient for the counterplan to be exclusive with the affirmative plan's agent of change? In other words, is a counterplan that adopts socialism in the United States mutually exclusive with an affirmative plan that uses the United States Federal Government to implement its plan? Or must the counterplan exclude the action called for in the affirmative plan rather than the agent that performs the action? These questions will be addressed in the remainder of the study.

The third standard of competitiveness is net benefits. This standard, as argued above, consists of pure policy comparison. The judge is considered to be a rational decision maker, whose main goal is to maximize the advantages of a policy decision, and minimize the disadvantages. Thus, the judge weighs advantages and disadvantages of the affirmative plan versus advantages and disadvantages of the counterplan plus the affirmative plan to determine if the counterplan is competitive. Although this standard has been attacked, it is widely accepted and used by judges and debaters alike. It is argued that this standard of competitiveness is the best, since it is the most analogous to the real world. Representatives in Congress attempt to reach decisions that are the most net beneficial, and monetary constraints on policy formulation
are vitally important to them. But this standard of competitiveness has its problems, one being that of extra-competitive advantages stemming from overly inclusive counterplans. Those counterplans that feed the world and claim that this is a more important goal than the affirmative plan are considered by some to be illegitimate and non-competitive. Perhaps Kaplow's solution of utilizing permutations as a test for competitiveness will alleviate these problems with extra-competitive counterplans.

The fourth standard of competitiveness that arises out of this discussion is that of philosophical competitiveness. If the affirmative plan and counterplan are truly philosophically opposed, this is a good standard of competitiveness. However, many negative teams claim that their counterplan is philosophically opposed to the affirmative plan simply because they do not support the resolution while the affirmative team does. Certainly, any counterplan would be competitive by this interpretation of philosophical competitiveness! If the two philosophies truly compete in an ideological sense, they may be considered legitimately competitive. However, it is also clear that in the real world, policy makers adopt philosophically competitive policies quite often to please various constituencies. For example, the federal government requires warning labels on cigarette packages, claiming that cigarette smoking is hazardous to health, but also provides
subsidies to tobacco farmers, encouraging them to continue the production of cigarettes. It is therefore difficult to determine if philosophical competitiveness provides a clear cut standard for debaters and judges to use in a debate round. Another question that arises regarding philosophical competitiveness is whether the counterplan should be philosophically opposed to the resolutonal change proposed, or with the status quo as it exists. In other words, does a socialism counterplan philosophically compete with an affirmative plan that simply continues our democratic form of government, but does nothing designed to enhance or perpetuate that form of government? Again, this question will be answered in the conclusion of this study.

The final standard of competitiveness is one that is not explicitly found in the literature, but is based on Patterson and Zarefsky's notion of debate as hypothesis testing. If it is true that the purpose of debate is to test the truth of the resolution, can not the negative team propose a counterplan that competes with the resolution as a whole, but not necessarily with the specific affirmative plan? In other words, is resolutonal competitiveness legitimate? For example, the 1982-83 intercollegiate debate resolution was, Resolved: That all U. S. military intervention into the internal affairs of any foreign nation or nations in the Western Hemisphere should be prohibited. Many affirmative teams claimed that intervention in El
Salvador should be prohibited due to human rights violations in that nation. Many negative teams claimed, however, that the wording of the resolution implied that all intervention into every nation in the Western Hemisphere was to be prohibited, since the term "any nation" can mean all nations. Under that topic, a negative counterplan that called for intervention into Nicaragua to overthrow the Sandinista government would deny the truth of the resolution, and thus be competitive with the resolution as a whole. Even though the counterplan did not compete with the specific affirmative plan of stopping intervention into El Salvador, it was claimed to compete with the entire resolution. Of course, the question of whether "any nation" means "all nations" is subject to debate, but the notion of resolutinal competitiveness is clearly defended by the negative in this type of counterplan. There are some questions concerning resolutinal competitiveness as well. First, this standard assumes that the resolution, rather than the specific affirmative plan, is the focus of the debate. This is a controversial question currently in academic debate. Second, does resolutinal competitiveness collapse the burdens of proof of the negative team? It should be remembered that a counterplan must be non-topical as well as competitive. Does the concept of resolutinal competitiveness deny the importance of the burden of competitiveness; is it merely sufficient for a counterplan
to be non-topical? Third, the question of agent of change becomes important once again. Is a counterplan that advocates a different agent of change to accomplish the same action advocated by the affirmative plan resolutionally competitive? Since the resolution specifies that the United States Federal Government should act, would mandating socialism compete with those terms of the resolution, and would that be sufficient for competitiveness? Clearly, these are vitally important questions to consider, and the purpose of this study is to provide answers to them.

In conclusion, there have been significant advances in counterplan theory over the years. Many changes have occurred, and the use of counterplans has grown. However, there are still several questions to be answered concerning counterplan competitiveness standards. New innovations in counterplan strategy have been encouraged. But it now seems that these new innovations are outpacing the capacity of debate theory to deal with them and to provide rational frameworks for debaters and judges to analyze them. Academic debate may be in the same position now that it was in 1975, when Lichtman and Rohrer called for debate theory to catch up with debate practice (1975, 70). Certainly, it is time to review counterplan theory and attempt to provide answers to these compelling questions that face the activity.
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SOCIALISM, ANARCHY AND WORLD GOVERNMENT:
COUNTER-SYSTEM COUNTERPLANS

Politicians, scholars and philosophers frequently reflect on what the ideal world society would be like. There are many problems in our modern technological society, and people wonder if there is an easy solution to these problems. Not only do scholars and politicians search for alternative ways of looking at world problems, but debaters and debate coaches do as well. This search for alternative viewpoints emerged recently in academic debate with the strategy of the counter-system counterplan. As the use of this strategy has grown in intercollegiate debate, teams from the University of Wisconsin, Loyola Marymount University, Georgia State University, Northwestern University, Wake Forest University, the University of Minnesota, and other colleges across the nation have argued in favor of socialism, anarchy or world government, as an alternative solution to the problems isolated by affirmative teams.¹ In the quarterfinal debate round at the 1985 National Debate Tournament, Loyola Marymount University defeated Claremont McKenna College with a counterplan strategy that called for the abolition of nation states and
the formation of a federal world government. It is clear that this strategy has become accepted in college debate, in spite of controversy surrounding these counterplans. The question arises whether this strategy meets the traditional burdens required of all counterplans. Specifically, the question of competitiveness of counter-system counterplans is asked. This portion of the study will provide a comprehensive view of these counterplans. The traditional burdens of non-topicality, competitiveness and advantages will be summarized for each of the common counter-system counterplans. The next portion of the study will attempt to determine if such claims in favor of competitiveness of the counter-system counterplans are valid.

Initially, however, it is necessary to note that the view of alternative systems of government as argued in debate rounds may not necessarily conform to the pure philosophical ideas behind these systems. Debate is not necessarily an activity that is designed to formulate ideas that would actually become public policy, but is geared toward stimulating the intellectual abilities of students and coaches through intensive research, organizing complex subjects into compact, concise positions, and forcing quick thinking under rather strenuous circumstances. Since debate requires each individual to present the best possible case for his or her position, debate tends to deal with ideal worlds and ideal situations that may not necessarily be
accepted by political leaders concerned with pragmatism. As a result, these counter-system counterplans may not reflect the traditional notions held by political scientists of what constitutes socialism, anarchy, or world government. This study is concerned with how debaters and coaches view these alternative systems of government in debate rounds. Thus, this study will examine these systems as ideal forms of government.

Before describing the counterplans themselves it is necessary to review the traditional burdens a counterplan must fulfill. Each counterplan must be outside the boundaries of the debate resolution, or in other words, it must be non-topical. This is to guarantee that one team argues in favor of the resolution and the other team argues against it. In addition, each counterplan must compete with the affirmative plan or system. As discussed in the previous chapter, a counterplan is competitive with an affirmative plan if it is mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan, net beneficial over the affirmative plan, philosophically opposed to the affirmative plan, redundant with the affirmative plan, or competitive with the resolution as a whole. Finally, a counterplan must achieve benefits, or advantages which warrant its acceptance by the debate judge. Each of these burdens of a counterplan will be reviewed for each of the
counter-system counterplans under discussion.

Socialism

Socialism, as a system of government and economics, is prevalent in the world today. Of course, the United States is not a socialist nation but rather a capitalist democratic nation. In academic debate, some negative teams claim that the capitalist system of production is to blame for many of the world's problems, and that if the United States were to become a socialist nation, peace and equality would result. The negative strategy of the counterplan requires that the team advocate a plan which will alleviate these problems. Unlike legislation, however, both affirmative and negative plans tend to be quite vague to allow latitude in interpretation by the debaters. Thus, a negative counterplan to convert the United States into a socialist nation might mandate that all forms of production will be turned over to the control of the workers, and that each community will be governed by its own citizens similar to a commune. On the other hand, the negative plan might mandate a form of centralized socialism similar to the Soviet Union's political and economic system.

In this study, a decentralized form of socialism emphasizing worker self-management and local political control similar to the cooperatives of Mondragon in the Basque region of Spain (Carnoy and Shearer 149-50) will be
considered. This example of decentralized socialism has been chosen because it appears to be the most common example used by debaters when they employ this strategy. In addition, the Mondragon cooperatives have been successful in replacing capitalism, so they are worthy of discussion.

How the transition to socialism will be accomplished is answered by the concept of fiat. Fiat power, as it is referred to, is a "rule of the game" in debate which allows the participants to simply assume that the affirmative (or negative) plan is already in existence so that the benefits and drawbacks may be discussed. The power of fiat assures that neither team argues about whether or not the opponent's plan would actually be adopted. The central question in the debate is whether the policy should be adopted. Whether the counter-system counterplans abuse the power of fiat is another controversial question, but one that is not addressed in this study. But it is important to understand that the question of whether or not United States policy makers would actually adopt a plan of decentralized socialism for the nation is one that is not to be raised in a debate round.

After presenting the negative counterplan, the first negative speaker then presents the reasons why the counterplan meets traditional burdens; non-topicality, competitiveness, and advantages. Traditionally, most intercollegiate debate resolutions are worded similarly to
the 1984-85 debate resolution which is, Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should significantly increase exploration and/or development of space beyond the earth's mesosphere. In other words, most debate resolutions contain the phrase "the United States Federal government should. . . ." Therefore, a negative team proposing decentralized socialism for the United States would argue that in the counterplan, the United States Federal Government is not acting; in fact, it is dissolved. The negative team would argue that since each word in the resolution is placed there for a reason, each word is important. If the negative plan calls for action outside the boundaries of any of the words in the resolution, including "the United States Federal Government," it is non-topical. In addition, since "the" is an exclusive article, the negative team would argue that even if "a" United States Federal Government acts in the counterplan, it is not "the" United States Federal Government referred to in the resolution. The negative team would also argue that the counterplan is non-topical since it does not deal specifically with the problem area of the topic. Decentralized socialism does not directly mandate anything concerning the development of outer space. Since the counterplan does not directly act to increase the development of space, it is arguably non-topical.

After arguing that the counterplan is non-topical, the
first negative speaker attempts to prove that the counterplan is competitive with the affirmative plan or the resolution. As noted in the previous chapter, a counterplan is competitive if it is mutually exclusive, net beneficial, philosophically competitive, or redundant with the affirmative plan or competitive with the entire resolution. In this section of the first negative speech, the debater usually begins to introduce quotations from qualified sources to back up his or her claims. These quotations should aim to prove that the counterplan is competitive with the plan.

A negative counterplan that mandates decentralized socialism in the United States is argued to be mutually exclusive with affirmative plans under the typical debate resolution. The first negative speaker would argue that it is physically or structurally impossible for the two plans to coexist. Perhaps obviously, the United States could not be a nation with centralized capitalism and decentralized socialism at the same time. "... as G. D. H. Cole wrote earlier in the century, 'the choice to-day is no longer between competition and monopoly, but between monopoly capitalism and socialism'" (Crosland 496). The judge of the debate round must make the choice between socialism and capitalism. He or she may not choose to have both in their ideal world society. In other words, the plan and the counterplan compete with each other. Since the affirmative
plan calls for the continuation of the United States Federal Government to oversee and implement its mandates, it is mutually exclusive with the negative plan which calls for abolition and replacement of that government. In this way, the negative team would argue that the counterplan is mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan.

The first negative speaker would also argue that the counterplan is net beneficial over the affirmative plan. This is true if adoption of the plan and counterplan together, if physically possible, is less desirable than adoption of the counterplan alone. In this portion of his or her speech, the first negative speaker would argue that the capitalist system itself produces evils that can only be eliminated through the abolition of capitalism and the implementation of socialism. It would be undesirable to opt to continue capitalism in any form. Obviously, this standard of competitiveness relies on the substantive arguments, or advantages, to each plan. As such, the decision as to whether the counterplan is competitive by the net benefits standard can only be determined by the judge after these substantive arguments are evaluated.

A counterplan is also competitive with an affirmative plan if it is philosophically opposed to the plan. It is argued by the first negative speaker that a rational policy maker, or debate judge, would not vote to adopt two philosophically opposed policies at the same time. In the
case of decentralized socialism, the first negative speaker would argue that since capitalism and socialism are based on two opposing philosophies, the negative counterplan competes with the affirmative plan. As John Stephens wrote:

> Socialism can only be created through the abolition and transcendence of advanced capitalism, not because history is predetermined but because socialism is nothing more than the negation of capitalism, the realization of the potentialities created by capitalism but suppressed by its contradictory structure (12).

The first negative speaker would argue, based on this quotation, that the philosophy of socialism is the antithesis of capitalism, and therefore, the counterplan is competitive with the affirmative plan which upholds the United States Federal Government. In addition, the first negative may argue that the assumptions behind each of these systems of government are different. Carnoy and Shearer write that the economic philosophy of socialism is different from that of capitalism, which is based on neoclassical economic theory (15). In this way, the first negative argues that socialism and capitalism are inconsistent philosophies, and that they cannot exist together in any pure form. The counterplan which mandates the philosophy of decentralized socialism for the United States is competitive with the affirmative plan that implicitly mandates the
A counterplan is also competitive with an affirmative plan if it is redundant. In other words, if it can be shown that the counterplan achieves the same benefits as the affirmative plan, there is no need to adopt both plans. A rational policy maker, or debate judge, would not adopt two plans that achieve the same advantages or benefits. Rather, he or she would choose one over the other. For any counterplan, the case for redundancy depends on what problem area the resolution addresses. For example, the 1984-85 debate resolution calling for increased development of outer space is well-suited for world government counterplans. Since outer space knows no national boundaries, a negative counterplan calling for a world government may well succeed more effectively in developing outer space than sovereign states. In addition, the case for redundancy also depends on the specific benefits claimed to result from the affirmative plan. The negative counterplan must achieve all of the affirmative plan's advantages if it is to be considered redundant. Assume that the debate resolution is that the United States Federal Government should work to reduce discrimination against women and minorities. A negative team calling for decentralized socialism would argue that its plan would do a better job of reducing discrimination because capitalist hierarchies are responsible for the problems faced by women and minorities.
(Ward 183). If a socialist government were to appear in the United States, these problems would be eradicated (Ward 240). In this case, the counterplan would be competitive with the affirmative plan.

If it can be shown that the counterplan achieves the same advantages as the affirmative plan, it would be redundant for the judge to adopt both. As is true for the net benefits standard, redundancy can only be determined after the judge evaluates the substantive arguments in the debate. An affirmative team could argue that socialist institutions, not capitalist ones, reinforce discrimination. The judge would have to consider these claims when evaluating the issue of redundancy.

Finally, the first negative speaker advocating a socialism counterplan would argue that it is competitive with the resolution. Earlier in his or her speech, the first negative speaker argues that the counterplan is non-topical. At this point, he or she would argue once again that each word in the resolution is put there for a reason and each word is important. Since the term "the United States Federal Government" is in the resolution, it is a term that is important to discuss. The agent of change in the resolution, it is argued, is vitally important to consider in a debate round. The framers of the resolution intended the affirmative team to use the United States Federal Government as its agent of change. Therefore, if
the negative team proposes a counterplan that abolishes the agent of change and calls for a substitute agent, it is competitive with the resolution as a whole. In other words, the first negative speaker argues that the judge of the debate does not vote for an affirmative or negative plan at the end of the debate round. Rather, the judge votes in favor of or against the resolution. If a negative counterplan precludes the adoption of the resolution, it is competitive with the resolution and all affirmative plans within the scope of that resolution.

Since a comprehensive system of decentralized socialism in the United States would not be possible with the continued existence of the United States Federal Government, the negative counterplan competes with the resolution. The negative team argues that it is irrelevant if its counterplan is not directly germane to the problem area discussed by the affirmative team. It is competitive with the resolution, which the affirmative team is obligated to defend.

In summary, a negative team arguing for decentralized socialism would claim its counterplan is mutually exclusive, net beneficial, philosophically opposed, or redundant with the affirmative plan or competitive with the entire resolution. These specific claims would be made by the negative team when it defends the competitiveness of its counterplan. The final burden a counterplan must meet is
that it must be beneficial or advantageous to adopt. The next section constitutes a brief explanation of how negative teams justify a shift from capitalism to decentralized socialism in the United States.

Initially the negative team argues that a shift to decentralized socialism in the United States is a feasible alternative. Mondragon, a town in the Basque region of northern Spain, is served by eighty-two financial, industrial, and service cooperatives that dominate the economy (Carnoy and Shearer 149). The cooperative system there was founded in the 1950s by a Basque priest, Don Jose Maria Arizmendi and has annual sales that total approximately four hundred million dollars (Carnoy and Shearer 149-50). The first negative speaker would argue that this system in Mondragon proves that decentralized socialism is successful in replacing capitalism. He or she would also argue that the potential for such success in the United States is high. For example, eighteen plywood firms in the Pacific Northwest are operated under a system similar to the Mondragon cooperatives. These firms gross from three to fifteen million dollars annually, and some have been in operation for thirty years under worker control (Carnoy and Shearer 145). This example is used to show that decentralized socialism can be effective in the United States. In addition, the negative team would argue that the transition from our capitalist society to a socialist one
would be well-accepted and rapid. Stephens argues that although the transition cannot occur overnight, it can be rather rapid (14). Sombart writes:

... all the factors that till now have prevented the development of socialism in the United States are about to disappear or to be converted into their opposite, with the result that in the next generation socialism in America will very probably experience the greatest possible expansion of its appeal (119).

Finally, Gintis argues that socialism in the United States would require "no radical break with the cultural and political traditions of our society" but rather the intensification of those traditions that already exist (14). In this way, the negative team argues that socialism would be easy to attain in the United States and is a viable alternative to capitalism.

But why should the United States shift from its traditional system of capitalism to decentralized socialism? In the next portion of the speech, the first negative speaker would present the charges against the capitalist status quo as reasons to justify the negative team's proposed radical change. The negative team would argue first that, in general, the capitalist system of production is undesirable. Benjamin Ward claims that capitalism is responsible for economic inequality, military imperialism,
racism, sexism, and alienation (181-86). These evils are argued to be significant enough to justify at least an attempt to formulate a more humane society. Specifically, however, the negative team would argue that capitalism is responsible for many of the wars fought in our generation. Ward argues that capitalist societies like the United States are forced into military intervention in order to protect business interests in unstable parts of the world (182). Sherman claims that in the future, with more American companies expanding overseas, the cost of economic stability for the United States will be bigger and costlier Vietnams (141). Eventually, Sherman argues, the potential risks involved in military intervention will grow. He states, "... capitalist imperialism ... does produce clashes that could lead to a world holocaust" (320). The negative team would argue that the chances of the world surviving a worldwide imperialist war are slim and that we must attempt to look at radical solutions to such immense problems today.

Not only does capitalism encourage imperialist wars, but it also encourages destruction of the world's natural environment. The goal of capitalist production is expansion and profit-making, and because of this goal, capitalism encourages the rape of the land (Sherman 75). If allowed to continue now when the earth has almost reached its ecological limits, world citizens will face the greatest
environmental challenges ever encountered by mankind (Sherman 78-9). The negative team, therefore, argues that capitalism, by its very nature, will lead the world to the brink of disaster. Its proposed solution to these problems is a form of socialism for the United States to prevent the imperialist wars and the rape of the land.

At this point, the negative team must provide support for its claims that socialism is the key to solving these massive problems caused by capitalism. Once again, quotations from experts in the field are offered as evidence to support these claims. Gintis writes that socialism is merely an extension of democratic principles into the economic and family lives of citizens. Therefore, it serves as a buffer against economic inequality, discrimination and alienation (12). Sherman claims that socialism will provide for economic security, enhanced political participation and liberation for women (80). In addition, Sherman writes that military imperialism would be reduced if the ordinary citizens of the United States, rather than the wealthy and powerful, had control over decisions made by the government (172). In this way, imperialist wars would be prevented and economic and social well-being would result for people in the United States. The negative team proposing decentralized socialism for the United States would in this way present the case for their proposal. They argue that there is a need for socialism, it is possible to accomplish
this goal, and it would alleviate the problems of capitalism.

In summary, the negative team proposing a socialism counterplan must prove it to be non-topical, competitive and advantageous. If at the end of the debate round, the judge considers that all three of these burdens have been met, the negative team would win the debate.

Anarchy

Life in twentieth-century American society is extremely complex. Bureaucracy seems to surround us every day. The size of government seems to have grown immensely, whether in the area of national defense or social spending. In thinking about how to manage this complex society of ours, some scholars believe that the key to returning some sense of humanity to this dehumanizing world lies in a return to a more natural state for mankind. Specifically, some scholars believe that the solution to our root problems in society is to convert our system of government from a bureaucratic-capitalist system to a type of anarchy. These scholars argue that humans were intended to live as free beings and that government, inevitably supported by coercion, denies us that freedom. Debaters as well argue in support of a transition from government to anarchy. This portion of the study will describe the debater's view of anarchy as a type of counter-system counterplan. First, there will be a description of the type of plan that would
be used by the negative team when advocating anarchy in a debate round. Then the burdens that all counterplans must fulfill will be reviewed and summarized for the anarchy counterplan.

A negative team proposing a system of anarchy as a counterplan does not have a great variety of types of anarchy from which to choose as a model for its plan. There are many types of socialism, but few types of anarchy. Although the widely held definition of anarchy as absence of government is accurate, the pejorative sense of the term is not accurate (Guerin 11). Anarchy is concerned with the liberation of humans from the coercion of the state system. Anarchy is defined as a system in which all share a commitment to voluntarism, decentralization, and freedom (Clark 6). Because all share in a feeling of consciousness and respect for others, the transition to such a society would not be violent (Falk 278-9). A negative counterplan proposing anarchy would simply mandate that all functions of government will be stopped, and a system of anarchy based on worker self-management and communal living will replace it. Police forces would be disbanded under the negative counterplan, and each community would control its own social environment. Again, plans are worded vaguely on purpose to allow interpretation by the debaters throughout the round. After presenting the plan, the first negative speaker presents the various reasons why the counterplan meets all
of the traditional burdens.

As previously noted, each counterplan proposed by a negative team must be non-topical. Similar to the non-topicality defense of socialism, anarchy is argued to be non-topical on the basis of the term "the United States Federal Government." Most debate resolutions use that term to describe the desired agent of change, and since anarchy means the absence of government (Guerin 11) the counterplan is non-topical. Since each word in the resolution is important, the inclusion of the word "government" has a purpose. The absence of government cannot be construed as government, according to the negative team. In addition, a counterplan advocating anarchy does not directly call for action in the problem area of the resolution. Mandating anarchy in no way directly increases the development of outer space, for example. The negative team could argue that since no action central to the problem area occurs as a result of the counterplan, it is non-topical.

After presenting the defense of non-topicality, the first negative speaker goes on to argue that the counterplan is competitive with the affirmative plan or the resolution. It is argued that anarchy is mutually exclusive with most affirmative plans. This is quite obvious, since most affirmative plans represent legislation. Affirmative plans are almost by definition seen as actions that a government is taking. A negative counterplan that mandates a stop to
the entire machinery of government and regulation is competitive with legislation. Lester Mazor writes:

... anarchy opposes law. ... those who embrace anarchy say that law cannot lead to justice, cannot establish order. Law, in their experience, only denies freedom (147).

Other scholars argue that anarchy represents a complete denial of government. John Clark claims:

One such definition would see anarchism as a movement that is defined by its complete rejection of government. A great deal of evidence from the anarchist tradition could be pointed out in support of this view (4).

Another scholar supporting this argument is Bookchin, who writes, "The absolute negation of the state is anarchism . . ." (41). The negative team would argue that it is physically impossible to have government and no government at the same time, so an anarchy counterplan is mutually exclusive with almost any affirmative plan.

Anarchy as a counter-system counterplan is also argued as net beneficial over affirmative plans. Again, net benefits can only be determined by evaluating the substantive arguments for each plan at the end of the debate round. But here the negative team could argue that it is best to adopt the anarchy counterplan alone instead of in conjunction with the affirmative plan because the benefits
of anarchy can only be seen with an absolute and complete withdrawal from all forms of government. Incremental solutions or gradual reforms will not provide the quick answers and solutions to our problems that we need (Bookchin 38). The first negative speaker would argue that it is undesirable to adopt both plan and counterplan together because the solution needed is a drastic one. Rather, the judge should adopt the counterplan alone.

Anarchism is also argued to be philosophically opposed to most affirmative plans. The philosophy of anarchism is based on a view of human nature that claims humans are rational and cooperative beings (Zinn ix-x), while the philosophy of government, and thus affirmative plans, is that humans need to be told what to do and what not to do. The anarchist believes in voluntarism and not legislation. These two positions are philosophically inconsistent since anarchy represents absolute freedom with no restrictions and law restricts human freedom. Richard DeGeorge reflects this absolute viewpoint when he writes:

Since freedom, justice and maximized human well-being are incompatible with the state, government, and law, and in general with any form of organized authority, they should be done away with (92).

In this way, the first negative speaker would argue that anarchy is philosophically inconsistent with the affirmative
plan. In addition, the negative team could argue that the philosophy of the counterplan is no government, and the philosophy of the affirmative plan is government, so therefore they philosophically compete. The affirmative team upholds the value of government and the negative team denies it.

The claim of redundancy for an anarchy counterplan is similar to that of any other counterplan. If it is adequately shown at the end of the round that the proposed system of anarchy can achieve all of the advantages claimed by the affirmative team as a result of their plan, it is redundant and competitive. Again, redundancy as a standard of competitiveness relies on the substantive arguments presented for each plan. The judge could not look at the two plans by themselves at the end of the round to decide if they were redundant. He or she would have to evaluate argumentation about the benefits and advantages of each system instead.

Finally, the first negative speaker would argue that the anarchy counterplan is competitive because it is inconsistent with the entire resolution. Not only does the counterplan compete with the specific affirmative plan, it competes with the resolution as a whole. The term "the United States Federal Government" assumes, and explicitly calls for, a government of some sort to act in a certain area. A counterplan that mandates the opposite of
government is opposite the entire resolution since each word in the resolution must have meaning. Anarchy is the absolute negation of government, as McIntosh writes:

... anarchism ... attempt[s] to negate the whole realm of the political: the state apparatus, positive law, political power, and the political process (263).

Since anarchy is the opposite of government, it competes with a debate resolution that calls for the government to act. In this way the first negative speaker would argue that the anarchy counterplan is resolutionally competitive. The first negative would also argue that it is appropriate to debate about the wisdom of the agent of change chosen for the resolution. The negative team would argue that the agent of change is chosen for a reason and that the framers of the resolution intended for it to be debated. Otherwise, different words would have been chosen. Thus, if it is legitimate to consider the agent of change rather than the problem area of the topic to decide resolutonal competitiveness, anarchy counterplans are competitive.

Finally, the first negative speaker justifies the proposed change to anarchy. Again, this portion of the speech consists of charges against the present system that can be corrected by the negative counterplan. One common criticism of anarchy as view of society is that it is utopian and impractical. But anarchists themselves claim
that this charge is not true. One anarchist writes:

Because anarchism is constructive, anarchist theory emphatically rejects the charge of utopianism. It uses the historical method in an attempt to prove that the society of the future is not an anarchist invention, but the actual product of the hidden effects of past events (Guerin 41).

In other words, anarchists believe that historically, there are examples of anarchist societies that functioned very well and provided for the needs of all people in the society (Falk 287). These past examples prove that it is possible to create a workable anarchist society. Such past examples include the anarchist societies in Spain in the 1930s, the Paris Commune of 1871, and even the populist phase of the modern Chinese Cultural Revolution (Falk 285-87). Anarchism is not utopian since it has actually been instituted in certain societies. In addition, negative teams could bolster the credibility of their anarchist solution by arguing that Americans are on the verge of accepting a drastic reduction in the influence of government in their lives. Bookchin argues that Americans are becoming more distrustful of institutions, and that this sense of distrust can set the stage for an anarchist revolution (48). Read claims that if anarchy were made clear to citizens, it would become popular and millions would accept it (36). Thus, anarchy can be a viable but optimistic solution to the some
of the world's problems.

The next burden of the first negative speaker is to prove what those world problems are that need to be addressed with such a drastic change. Anarchists believe that government is responsible for chaos and disorder in society. Zinn contends government is the root cause of war, starvation and nuclear weapons and the best solution to these pressing global problems is a move to anarchy (ix). Guerin is less specific when he writes that government is responsible for disorder and that "only a society without government could restore the natural order and recreate social harmony" (11-12). So government fails to carry out its primary goal; preserving social harmony.

But not only does government fail to keep the peace, negative teams argue that it attempts to do so through the use of coercion. Anarchists believe that human beings were intended to be free and that government by law infringes upon that freedom. Guerin argues that all governments are totalitarian, since all governments want to control and subordinate individuals (15). Government is repressive by its very nature. Others argue that "law and order" does not create order but simply fear through the use of threats to force people to stay in their assigned places (Zinn xv). This type of coercion, according to the negative team violates the very nature of human beings. Finally, the first negative speaker would argue that society with
government eventually leads to wars and environmental
damage. Building a strong central government requires a
strong standing army, and the growth of defense spending
increases the chances of war (Guerin 16-7).

In addition, the centralized capitalist system of
production threatens the natural environment of the earth.
This exploitation of nature eventually will threaten human
survival (Bookchin 39). This combination of chaos and
disorder, coercion, environmental degradation, and war are
enough to justify a change from government to anarchy,
according to the negative team proposing this counter-system
counterplan.

Finally, the first negative speaker must prove that
anarchy is really the solution to these problems facing the
world. Falk argues that the goal of anarchy is the minimal
existence of government so that the human potential for
cooperation and happiness can be achieved to its fullest
(279). Since government is seen by anarchists to be the
root of all evil in the world, the elimination of government
is the solution to those evils. In addition, the first
negative might argue that anarchist societies can be
self-sufficient and loosely organized into federations to
provide any minimal structure for society that may be needed
(Guerin 55). This is how the negative team argues in favor
of an anarchy counterplan. The first negative speaker
presents a plan for transition to an anarchist society that
is non-topical, competitive with the affirmative plan or the resolution, and one that is able to provide a solution to the problems created by modern government.

World Government

The last type of counter-system counterplan to be considered is world government. War, competition for resources, famine, and poverty plague the nations of the world today. Some scholars believe that the only alternative to nuclear holocaust is a transition from a system of government based on nation states and national sovereignty to one based on cooperation through world government. Some debaters also argue that world government is the only possible solution for the world's problems, and that it is vital for our society to at least attempt to change its system of government. This portion of the study will describe how debaters argue in favor of world government in counter-system counterplans. First, a possible negative plan will be described, and then it will be shown how this plan for world government meets the traditional counterplan burdens.

Unlike anarchy and socialism, theories surrounding various types of world government are very clear cut and concrete. Specific proposals for transition to a world government can be found in the literature. Specifically, a program called the World Order Models Project, or WOMP, developed its model for an ideal global society based on a
form of world government. The Institute for World Order was initiated in 1968, as a forum to discuss serious global problems and develop alternative visions of world society (Falk 52). Scholars from all over the world participate in the Project and working together, these scholars develop frameworks of "world order values" that are agreed to be necessary for a just world order. These world order values include the minimization of collective violence, the maximization of economic well-being, the maximization of social and political justice, and the maximization of ecological quality (Falk 52).

In addition, the World Order Models Project develops complex models of government that its members claim are workable and feasible on a global level. The model WOMP advocates is a federal system based on decentralized institutional authority; the goal is not to harden the international system but to soften the state system (Falk 304). The ideal government proposed by WOMP would include multi-state authorities to promote the general welfare, regional and world political institutions with representation, regional and world specialized agencies to plan for the preservation of the environment, a world security system to reduce the level of arms in the world and to provide a small Court to carry out justice and rule by law (Kothari 52). Elaborate plans for the transition from our society of nation states to the federal world government
are formulated, debated and discussed. Intercollegiate debaters proposing counter-system counterplans see the value of the WOMP project as grounds for developing alternative solutions to world problems. As a result, world government counterplans are employed as a strategy against affirmative teams. Again, affirmative and negative teams are allowed much latitude in drafting the plans they present as solutions to world problems. A counter-system counterplan advocating world government would most likely mandate that the system of nation states be dissolved, and replaced by a federal system of world government based on the recommendations of the World Order Models Project. The negative team may then explain the specifics of WOMP during the debate as it becomes necessary.

The non-topicality defense for a world government counterplan is similar to that of socialism and anarchy. Most debate resolutions contain the phrase, "the United States Federal Government should . . . ", and the negative counterplan calls for abolition of the United States Federal Government. In this way, the first negative speaker argues that the counterplan is non-topical. In addition, the counterplan in no way mandates action specific to the problem area in the resolution. World government may be more effective in developing outer space, for example, but that action is not mandated in the counterplan. Thus, the counterplan is non-topical. Finally, since "the" is an
exclusive article, the topic is referring to a specific United States Federal Government, namely the one that currently exists. Even though the counterplan may eventually lead to a different type of federal government, it is non-topical because it abolishes "the" United States Federal Government.

The next task of the first negative speaker is to prove that the counterplan is competitive. Again, each of the traditional standards of competitiveness will be reviewed and the case for competitiveness of world government counterplans will be described. World government is argued to be mutually exclusive with affirmative plans, since the existence and support of national governments undermines the transition to world government. One scholar writes:

... as long as nation-states exist ... nationalism will remain alive, or at least dormant. Since nationalism wants to separate or to keep separate, it seems almost by definition disintegrative, dysfunctional, for world order (Van Den Bergh 101).

In this way, the negative team argues that world government is the opposite of nationalism, and since the affirmative team utilizes and thus upholds the system of nation-states, it upholds nationalism which is destructive for world order. In addition, the negative team would argue that the very structure of national governments is the principal barrier
to achieving a just world order. Kothari writes:

It can be seen that the principal stumbling block to achieving these conditions of life is not the absence of some centralized world authority but rather the present structures of dominance and inequality in the world that comprise the autonomy of individual states (51).

The entire system of state sovereignty must be abolished before progress can be made toward a just world order. Also, it is important for the negative team to argue that any action taken by a national government increases its power and reduces the chances for a world government. If an affirmative plan proposes a relatively minor change from the present system, the negative would argue that even minor changes support the system of state sovereignty. As Lin argues, national interest is always reflected in policies that are made, regardless of the type of policy advocated (287). Therefore, any policy made by a national government supports and enlarges that government. In this way, even small changes in policy can be seen to prevent the transition to a world government. Kissinger agrees when he writes that bureaucratic government has been reduced to a machine, where the people working for the government only serve and uphold the machine, rather than define its purpose (168). Each action taken by a bureaucracy is designed to serve and uphold that bureaucracy rather than to decide the
best direction for the bureaucracy to take. The negative team would also argue that it would be undesirable to continue the system of national sovereignty but modify it to accommodate world order values.

The first negative would argue that international and national policy actions compete with one another. In other words, he or she would argue that nationalism competes with internationalism (Lin 288). Jaguaribe agrees when he claims that the capitalist system of nationalism is by its very nature inconsistent with the concept of world government (218). Finally, to prove the case that world government counterplans are mutually exclusive with affirmative plans, the negative team would argue that incremental reforms of the state system and a gradual transition to a global world government would fail to achieve the desired system to uphold world order values. Falk clearly states this viewpoint:

WOMP is addressing a clear message to the world: the present system does not work: it cannot be incrementally repaired (74).

The first negative speaker would, in this way, argue that world government is mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan.

The case for net benefits of world government again is similar to that of socialism and anarchy. The first negative speaker must prove that adoption of world
government alone is superior to adoption of both world
government and the affirmative plan or the resolution. The
claim that incremental reforms fail to provide for world
order values is helpful here. The negative team would argue
that it is better to adopt world government alone as a
complete system than to attempt to reform the state system
in combination with a transition to world order. Again, the
claim for competitiveness based on the standard of net
benefits relies upon the substantive arguments, or
advantages associated with each plan. The debate judge
could only decide net benefits after these substantive
arguments are evaluated.

The first negative speaker would also argue that the
counterplan and the plan are philosophically competitive.
In so doing, the negative team would argue that the
counterplan upholds the value of cooperation among all
peoples, and the affirmative plan puts faith in the system
of state sovereignty. In other words, the negative believes
in the absence of nation-states and the affirmative believes
in the continuation of the system of nation-states. Stone
summarizes the philosophical thesis of Falk's work when he
writes:

\[ \ldots \text{the existence of these [state sovereignties] with present prerogatives, also blocks that access to the claims, aspirations, and expectations of the men and women of the planet which is needed to} \]
base a truly homocentric law, and inhibits the growth of a sense of commonality among them (35). The philosophy of sovereignty, then, inhibits the philosophy of community and cooperation that a WOMP system envisions. Therefore, the two philosophies are competitive with one another.

The claim of redundancy for a world government counterplan is also similar to that for socialism and anarchy. Depending upon the advantages claimed to result from the affirmative plan, the negative team would argue that world government achieves the same advantages. Again, this depends on the problem area of the debate resolution and the specific benefits of the affirmative plan. Both net benefits and redundancy can only be evaluated by the debate judge after substantive arguments about advantages are evaluated. One cannot look at the two plans by themselves and determine if they compete based on the net benefits or redundancy standards.

Finally, the first negative speaker would argue that the world government counterplan is competitive with the resolution as a whole. Since most resolutions call for action by the United States Federal Government, the counterplan is competitive. The counterplan calls for the abolition of the United States Federal Government and replaces it with a completely different system of government. If it is determined that each term in the
resolution is important, and if the counterplan competes with one term alone, it is competitive with the entire resolution and thus with the affirmative plan within that resolution. It is physically impossible to have the United States Federal Government act if the world is organized around a global governing system. Thus, the counterplan is competitive with the resolution as a whole.

After arguing that the counterplan is competitive, the first negative speaker presents the advantages to the counterplan that justify the radical change he or she is proposing. There are many reasons why a change from nation-states to world order is justified. Initially, the negative team would argue that a change to world government is a viable option. Mendlovitz claims that WOMP is not utopian, but rather a pragmatic and practical answer to the complex problems faced by the world (xii). Falk agrees when he writes:

No longer is such a futurist inquiry a utopian exercise for a questioning imagination. It should be relevant to the practitioners of power who govern our destiny as a nation and as a species (235).

The negative team could argue that utopianism is needed to encourage creativity in finding solutions to the complex problems facing the world today. One of these complex problems is the nuclear arms race. The nationalist system
of government is to blame for the high risk of nuclear war and the high cost of modern military weapons (Falk ix). The increasing economic and technological gap between the developing and developed nations is also blamed on the system of nation-states (Kothari 40-1). The future looks bleak for the world when the problems of resource scarcity and population growth are considered. Kothari argues that in the near future, the world may return to a new colonial era when the supply of scarce natural resources becomes critically low (41). War is seen as an inevitable result of such resource and population problems. The negative team would argue that these problems can only be averted through a transition to a world government based on the World Order Models Project. Schuman states the point very clearly:

World government in some form is both possible and imperative if the human race is to be saved from suicide during the remaining decades of the twentieth century. The only obstacles to its attainment are the ancient and obsolete superstitions of sovereignty and nationalism . . ." (230).

Falk contends that WOMP specifically provides the basis for economic and political justice on a global scale, and that it also will serve as a check on centralized governmental authority (54). Thus, the negative team proposing a system of world government would argue that their counterplan
provides the only answers to these problems faced by society, and since the counterplan is competitive with the affirmative plan and is non-topical, it should be adopted by the debate judge.

In summary, counter-system counterplans are useful and interesting strategies for negative teams. Since most debate resolutions call for action by the existing United States Federal Government, these counterplans seem to be non-topical and competitive with most affirmative plans. This is precisely the reason why some members of the debate community object to the use of counter-system counterplans. They can be used as a strategy against virtually every affirmative case and they envision systems that can be argued as utopian and unrealistic in the real world. The next portion of the study will examine the issue of competitiveness in depth. Are counter-system counterplans legitimately competitive with affirmative plans? What are the arguments that the affirmative and negative teams would present to justify their positions regarding competitiveness? The next section will attempt to answer these questions.
Notes

1 Based on observation and participation in intercollegiate debate, the author and her advisor generated a list of debate teams in the nation that have been known to propose counter-system counterplans as a negative strategy. This observation is based on a total of approximately fifty intercollegiate debate tournaments over a three year period. The list is most likely not exhaustive, since not all teams that utilize this strategy attended these fifty tournaments.

2 The author observed this quarterfinal debate at the 1985 National Debate Tournament held at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington. Loyola Marymount University defeated Claremont McKenna College by a split decision.
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CHAPTER IV

COMPETITIVENESS IN COUNTER-SYSTEM COUNTERPLANS

Socialism, anarchy, and world government counterplans are used as a negative strategy in academic debate. As seen in the previous chapter, negative teams using this strategy attempt to prove that the counterplans are competitive based on the traditional standards used to resolve the issue; mutual exclusivity, net benefits, philosophical competitiveness, redundancy and resolutional competitiveness. In each case, the first negative speaker presents the reasons why the counterplan meets each of these standards of competitiveness and explains why it forces the judge to choose between the plan and counterplan. The previous portion of the study describes and explains the counter-system counterplans in depth. This portion of the study will focus specifically on the question of competitiveness of these counterplans.

In order adequately to discuss the complex issue of competitiveness, a debate round in print will take place. First, the negative arguments in favor of the competitiveness of the counterplan under consideration will be presented. Then, possible affirmative arguments in response to the specific negative arguments will be
presented. Each side, negative and affirmative, will then rebut and rebuild the arguments that were originally presented. Through this method, the key issues involved in the question of competitiveness of counter-system counterplans will emerge. The next portion of the study will consider these key issues and provide suggestions for debate participants to modify debate practice and theory to account for these new counterplans.

Socialism

In the previous chapter, it is noted that socialism counterplans are justified as being competitive through the standards of mutual exclusivity, net benefits, philosophical competitiveness, redundancy, and resolutinal competitiveness. Each of these standards of competitiveness will be considered separately in this section of the study. The negative arguments and affirmative responses on the issue of mutual exclusivity will be summarized first, and then net benefits and the other standards of competitiveness will be considered.

Mutual Exclusivity

The first negative speaker advocating a socialism counterplan argues first that it is physically and structurally impossible to have capitalism and decentralized socialism at the same time. The arguments supporting this claim are reviewed in the previous chapter. However, the
second affirmative speaker may argue that this is not true, since the economy of a country like Sweden is a combination of socialism and capitalism. The existence and success of the Swedish economy proves that the claim that capitalism and socialism are structurally incompatible is false. It is possible, in other words, to have the affirmative plan and the negative plan in existence at the same time. If this is true, the plans are not mutually exclusive.

In addition, the second affirmative speaker would propose a specific permutation of the affirmative plan and negative plan to prove that the two plans can be combined in some fashion without losing any vital elements. For example, the second affirmative could argue that a permutation might be to adopt the affirmative plan first to reap its benefits, and then adopt the negative counterplan at a later time to reap its benefits. The judge would vote affirmative, if he or she decided to vote in favor of this permutation, because the first action taken is to uphold the debate resolution and adopt the affirmative plan. Only later is the negative plan adopted. The affirmative speaker would argue that he or she is not necessarily amending his or her plan to conform to this permutation, but rather that it is merely an example to prove that, theoretically, it is possible to adopt a combination of both plans.

Another possible affirmative strategy against the negative's claim of mutual exclusivity is to re-plan.
Re-planning is a new strategy that first was used in intercollegiate debate in early 1984, at the Glen R. Capp Invitational Debate Tournament at Baylor University. An affirmative team that chooses to re-plan argues that each debate resolution is written with certain assumptions in mind. If at any time, these assumptions are changed or challenged by the negative team, the affirmative team has the right to re-plan, in order to account for the change in assumptions. The affirmative plan would then fit into the frame of reference that the negative team calls for. For example, in the case of the counter-system counterplans, the affirmative team argues that one assumption of the debate resolution is that the United States Federal Government exists. When the resolution was written, the framers assumed that there would be a United States Federal Government to call upon as an agent of change. But once the negative team proposes to change that assumption, by offering a decentralized socialism counterplan, they change the rules of the game. The affirmative would argue that the negative team has changed the assumption that there is a United States Federal Government that can act. Therefore, in order to keep the frames of reference of the debaters consistent, the affirmative team modifies their plan so that it is adopted under a system of decentralized socialism. In this way, the second affirmative speaker attempts to force the negative team to argue with the action called for by the
affirmative plan, rather than the agent called upon to take that action. In summary, the second affirmative speaker would present a re-plan that takes the action called for by the resolution through whatever agent the negative counterplan calls for, in this case a system of decentralized socialism in the United States.

Finally, the second affirmative speaker would argue that the counterplan calling for decentralized socialism is not competitive with the affirmative plan, but rather just with the resolution as a whole. He or she would claim that the plan itself does not contain the words, "the United States Federal Government." Therefore, the plan by itself is not mutually exclusive with the counterplan. The counterplan calls for abolition of the United States Federal Government, and the affirmative plan does not mention that organization at all. In this way, the second affirmative speaker attempts to defeat the claim that the plan and the counterplan are mutually exclusive.

The second negative speaker, or in some cases the first negative rebuttalist, would attempt to rebuild the case for the claim of mutual exclusivity by defeating the affirmative arguments and rebuilding the negative ones. Initially, the negative speaker would argue that the example of Sweden is not analogous to the negative counterplan. It may be true that Sweden has a system that combines capitalism and socialism, but the proposed negative system is not similar
to Sweden's. Rather, the negative counterplan calls for decentralization of the entire economy and political system. Sweden has centralized political power through its legislative branch, but the negative counterplan does not advocate centralized political power. The argument that Sweden disproves the claim of mutual exclusivity is thus false.

The negative speaker would next be required to defeat the permutation offered by the second affirmative speaker, that of adopting the affirmative plan first and the counterplan later. The negative team would argue that the judge must assume simultaneous adoption of the two plans in order to test the claim of mutual exclusivity. If it were legitimate to argue for adoption of the two plans at different times, a negative team proposing a counterplan would always lose the debate, since the affirmative could argue for delaying action on the counterplan. That is not a fair test of whether or not the two plans could coexist. The only way to determine whether or not the plans are truly mutually exclusive is to see whether they could exist simultaneously, or be adopted simultaneously.

In addition, the negative speaker would argue that, assuming simultaneous adoption of the two plans, they cannot structurally coexist. The United States Federal Government as we know it today, could not take action to increase the development of outer space, for example, if it has been
replaced by a system of decentralized socialism. In other words, the counterplan actually precludes adoption of the affirmative plan, if the affirmative plan uses the United States Federal Government as its agent of change.

Finally, the negative speaker could indict the theory of permutations to defeat this affirmative argument. The negative speaker would claim that any permutation that the affirmative team proposes is illegitimate, since it is not presented in the original plan in the first affirmative constructive speech. It is unfair to the negative team if the affirmative team has the right to change its plan any time it wants to in the course of the debate. The affirmative could change the plan to avoid arguing against negative disadvantages to the plan, for example. Thus, the negative speaker would argue that permutations should not be allowed in the debate round. Also, the negative speaker could contend that the permutation proposed by the affirmative team does not fit within the scope of the resolution, or in other words, it makes the affirmative advantages extra-topical. Since affirmative teams are only allowed to claim advantages from parts of their specific plan that are topical, provisions added to the affirmative plan that make the counterplan non-competitive should be considered to be extra-topical provisions and not accepted by the judge in the debate round.

The next argument the negative speaker must defeat is
the re-plan proposed by the second affirmative speaker. Initially, the negative team could argue that the theory of re-planning is too vague to be considered by the judge in the debate. For example, how is one to determine what is an assumption of the resolution and what is not? How is it known that the term, "the United States Federal Government" constitutes an assumption and the term "exploration and development of space" does not? The negative speaker could in this way deny the validity of the assumptions of the theory of re-planning.

In addition, the negative team would argue that the strategy of re-planning is designed to avoid clash with substantive issues in the debate. Specifically, the negative speaker would claim that this strategy avoids argumentative clash over the term "the United States Federal Government" in the debate resolution. Each term in the resolution was put there for a purpose, and therefore, each term needs to be debated and discussed. The use of the re-plan avoids any discussion of the merits of decentralized socialism for the United States and instead forces discussion into other areas of the resolution. In general, the negative team claims that the agent of change must also be debated in the round, and that the strategy of re-planning precludes such debate.

Finally, the negative speaker would argue that the strategy of re-planning is illegitimate, for the same
reasons the strategy of permutations is illegitimate. It is unreasonable to allow the affirmative team to change its plan during the debate. Re-planning allows the affirmative team to avoid being responsible for the positions it initially advocates. A plan that increases exploration and development of space under a system of decentralized socialism is radically different from one that does so under the United States Federal Government. If an affirmative team is allowed to modify its plan in this way, it is not advocating a consistent position and is therefore not held responsible for the arguments it advances. In summary, the negative speaker would rebuild the claim that the counterplan is mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan by defeating each of the affirmative arguments against the claim.

Next, the affirmative rebuttalist would once again attempt to deny the negative claims of mutual exclusivity. He or she would do this by bringing each of the affirmative arguments one step further. To begin, the affirmative rebuttalist would argue that even though Sweden may not have the exact same system of socialism that the negative team advocates, at least it has a form of socialism. Therefore, it is not impossible for socialism and capitalism to exist at the same time, at least on a philosophical level. In this way, the affirmative rebuttalist applies this argument about Sweden to the claim of philosophical competitiveness.
This type of "cross-application" can be very effective in a debate round.

The next argument to address is the permutation presented by the affirmative team. The affirmative rebuttalist would argue that it is not necessary to assume that the two plans must be adopted simultaneously. In the end, the decision as to whether or not the plans are competitive is left up to the judge, and if he or she believes that the affirmative plan or even the negative plan should be adopted first, then that is the team that will win the debate round. In other words, the affirmative team is simply arguing that the counterplan is not by its very nature a reason to reject the affirmative plan. The negative plan does not contradict the affirmative plan, and so there is no theoretical reason why the affirmative plan could not be in existence when the transition to socialism occurs.

The affirmative speaker would be required to defend the theory of permutations as well. The affirmative team could argue that the permutation it has presented should not actually be considered as an addition to the affirmative plan. Rather, permutations should be considered to be merely a test of competitiveness. Permutations are proposed and discussed as a means of deciding if it is theoretically possible for the two plans to be molded into one. The affirmative team is not actually amending its plan when it
proposes a permutation but instead is pointing out that it would be possible, in theory, to amend it in such a way to achieve the benefits of both the plan and the counterplan. Since the affirmative team is not actually amending the plan and only using permutations as a test for competitiveness, it is not illegitimate. In addition, the affirmative rebuttalist would contend that since no plan provisions are being added, the permutation argument does not make the affirmative plan extra-topical either. It simply is a device used to determine competitiveness of a plan and a counterplan.

Finally, the affirmative rebuttalist must defend the affirmative strategy of re-planning. The affirmative team initially argues that the re-plan consists of adopting the affirmative plan under the negative frame of reference, decentralized socialism. The negative speakers claim that the theory of re-planning must be defended. Specifically, the negative team asks how the judge is to determine which phrases in the resolution are assumptions and which phrases should be debated. The affirmative speaker would argue that the assumptions in a debate resolution are the nouns that appear in the sentence. In other words, if the topic is, Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should significantly increase exploration and development of outer space, the fact that the United States Federal Government exists is an assumption, the fact that space exists is an
assumption, and the fact that exploration and development exist is an assumption. The existence of the United States Federal Government is a given that is not to be debated. Only the terms that constitute the central question of the resolution can be debated. To determine the central question of the resolution, it should be reworded to say, "what should be significantly increased?" The answer to this question is "exploration and development of outer space." Therefore, the framers of the resolution only intended the issue of whether or not space should be explored and developed to be relevant in the debate round. In this way, the affirmative speaker would claim that the agent of change is not intended to be debated under this topic.

The affirmative speaker may bolster this claim by arguing that if the framers of the resolution had intended the agent of change to be debated, they would have worded the resolution differently. If the topic is, Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should be strengthened to increase the exploration and development of outer space, the central question asked by the resolution is whether the United States Federal Government should be strengthened for the purposes of exploring and developing outer space. It is assumed that the United States Federal Government exists, but the central question calls for it to be strengthened. Since the original topic under
consideration is worded differently, that the United States Federal Government should develop outer space, the central question is whether or not the exploration and development of outer space is desirable. The question of who should carry out that action is not relevant to a decision over whether or not it should be done. In this way, the affirmative speaker could present a very cogent argument in support of the claim that the system of government mentioned in the debate resolution is simply an assumption that the current system will continue to exist. It is not the place of the debaters to argue whether or not it is desirable for that agent to continue to exist, unless the topic specifically calls for debate of the agent in the central question.

The negative speaker also argues that the strategy of re-planning is designed to avoid clashing with the substantive issues in the debate round. The affirmative speaker would contend that the negative team is more guilty of avoiding clash than the affirmative team. He or she would claim that focusing the debate on the agent of change alone avoids the discussion that was intended to take place; whether or not the exploration and development of outer space is desirable. In addition, as explained above, the agent of change is not intended to be the central question for debate. Rather, the action called for by the resolution should be the real concern.
Finally, the affirmative rebuttalist would need to argue that re-planning is not an abusive or illegitimate strategy. Similar to the defense of permutations, the affirmative team would claim that no actual modifications of the plan takes place with the strategy of re-planning. Rather, it is a device used to focus the debate on the actions taken by a given agent of change. The plan is the same as it was in the first affirmative speech; the frame of reference is all that has changed. The agent of change is now assumed by all to be a system of decentralized socialism and not the United States Federal Government.

In this way, the affirmative and negative speakers would debate the issue of whether or not a decentralized socialism counterplan is mutually exclusive with an affirmative plan. Both teams would attack the theoretical underpinnings of the other team's arguments and attempt to defeat them. A later section of this portion of the study will summarize some of the major questions that arise from this discussion of the issues involved in mutual exclusivity of counter-system counterplans.

Net Benefits

The next standard of competitiveness to be considered in the case of a decentralized socialism counterplan is the net benefits standard. The first negative speaker would argue that it is better for the judge to adopt the negative counterplan alone than to adopt a combination of the
affirmative and negative plans. This is claimed to be true since the capitalist system itself is responsible for many problems in the world, and decentralized socialism is a good solution to these problems.

In answering this claim, the second affirmative speaker would argue that the advantages purported to result from decentralized socialism are extra-competitive with the affirmative plan. In other words, the counterplan address an issue that has nothing to do with the affirmative plan at all. The counterplan addresses the problems of capitalism while the affirmative plan addresses the problems of exploring and developing outer space. The advantages from a negative counterplan must compete directly with the advantages of the affirmative plan. If this were not a legitimate requirement, a negative team could propose a counterplan that mandated worldwide nuclear disarmament and claim that it would accrue more benefits than any affirmative plan. In other words, the second affirmative speaker would argue that the benefits of socialism are not germane to a discussion of whether or not outer space should be explored and developed. Because this is the case, the counterplan is not net beneficial.

In response to this argument, the second negative speaker would contend that these advantages of decentralized socialism are not extra-competitive with the affirmative plan. He or she would argue that the United States Federal
Government, which is in the debate resolution and thus the affirmative system, consists of a capitalist economy. Therefore, the affirmative plan embraces capitalism. Since capitalism competes with socialism, the counterplan competes directly with the affirmative plan. The advantages that stem from decentralized socialism stem directly from a portion of the counterplan that competes with the affirmative plan; namely, the elimination of capitalism.

The final affirmative rebuttalist would claim that this argument, once again, can be resolved by asking what is and is not debatable in the resolution. Again, the negative team relies on the agent of change rather than the action mandated to determine competitiveness. The affirmative team would argue that the benefits of socialism are not germane to a choice between the affirmative and negative plans. Since the affirmative team is not required to defend the agent of change that is mentioned in the resolution, choosing between capitalism and socialism does not aid in the decision of whether or not to adopt the resolution. In this way, the affirmative and negative speaker would argue over whether or not a counterplan mandating decentralized socialism is competitive with affirmative plans using the net benefits standard.

**Philosophical Competitiveness**

The next standard of competitiveness posited by the negative team is concerned with whether or not the two plans
are philosophically opposed. The first negative speaker would argue that the philosophy of socialism and the philosophy of capitalism are inconsistent and therefore would not be upheld at the same time by a rational policy maker. The second affirmative speaker would argue that the affirmative team does not uphold the value of capitalism. In no way does the call for exploration and development of outer space demand support for a capitalist system of production. The affirmative team does not take a stand on whether or not the capitalist system should remain in existence. Rather, the philosophy of the affirmative team is that the development of outer space would be of great value to mankind. The affirmative plan does not mandate an allegiance to capitalism, and it is unreasonable to assume that it would result in strengthening capitalism. Therefore, the second affirmative speaker contends that the two plans are not philosophically competitive, since the affirmative team does not advocate capitalism.

The second negative speaker would argue that the affirmative team upholds the value of capitalism for two reasons. First, by embracing the United States Federal Government in its plan and resolution, the affirmative team embraces its system of production which is capitalism. By adding to the space program of the United States Federal Government, the affirmative plan supports the United States Federal Government's existence, and thus implicitly supports
the value of capitalism. Second, since the choice between capitalism and socialism is dichotomous, if one does not support socialism, he or she implicitly supports capitalism. Even though the affirmative plan does not mandate support for the capitalist system in the United States, by leaving out the call for a transition to decentralized socialism, it implicitly upholds the philosophy of capitalism.

The affirmative rebuttalist would answer these claims by contending that once again, the affirmative team is not bound to support the agent of change proposed in the resolution since it is merely an assumption of the resolution. In addition, the affirmative team would claim that it is impossible to determine whether one is implicitly supporting capitalism or simply remaining silent on the issue. In other words, how does the judge of the debate determine if the affirmative plan implicitly supports capitalism? The affirmative speaker would claim that if support for capitalism is not explicit in the plan, it is not present. In this way, the negative and affirmative teams would argue about whether a decentralized socialism counterplan is philosophically competitive with an affirmative plan.

Redundancy

The next standard of competitiveness argued by the negative concerns whether or not it would be redundant to adopt the counterplan and the affirmative plan at the same
time. The question of whether the counterplan achieves the affirmative advantages is important in deciding this issue. Because the standard of redundancy depends on the specific advantages claimed by the affirmative team, the claim for competitiveness cannot be evaluated in general terms. A specific affirmative plan and advantages would need to be considered and compared to the advantages of decentralized socialism.

But if it is assumed that the negative counterplan succeeds in achieving all of the affirmative advantages, the second affirmative speaker would argue that it would be desirable to have two or more policies operating to correct one problem. For example, both the federal government and the state governments have regulations concerning pollution control. Even though these may be redundant policies, the two systems coexist. It may even be necessary to adopt two policies to correct the same problem in order to achieve maximum benefits. Therefore, the affirmative team claims that simply because decentralized socialism achieves the affirmative advantages, it does not force the debate judge to choose between the two systems. Rather, it may be wise to adopt both plans to ensure that the advantages are achieved to the fullest.

The second negative speaker may argue that even though it may be possible to adopt both systems at the same time to achieve the maximum benefits, it would be wasteful and would
result in overlapping authority. Therefore, the negative team could contend that, using the standard of redundancy, even though the judge is not forced to choose between the two plans, it would be wiser to simply adopt one rather than both.

The affirmative rebuttalist would argue that if the negative speaker's claims are true, then redundancy is not a good test for determining competitiveness of counterplans. If the judge is not forced to choose between two plans, they do not directly compete with one another. Also, if it is possible for both plans to coexist, there is no reason why the two plans could not be adopted with coordination to guarantee that waste and overlapping authority are not significant problems. In this way, the affirmative and negative teams debate the merits of redundancy as a standard for judging competitiveness of counterplans.

Resolutional Competitiveness

The final standard of competitiveness used by the negative team to justify its counter-system counterplan of decentralized socialism is resolutional competitiveness. The negative team first argues that each word is placed in the resolution for a reason, and thus each word is important to debate. Therefore, the term "the United States Federal Government" is important and can be used to determine the issue of competitiveness. The negative team contends that its counterplan is competitive with the entire resolution
because it mandates that the United States Federal Government will no longer exist. Therefore, adoption of the counterplan precludes adoption of the resolution. If there is no United States Federal Government to act, the resolution cannot be adopted.

An affirmative speaker attacking this argument would first deny the claim that each word in the resolution is important to discuss. He or she would argue that the phrase, "Resolved: That" serves no argumentative purpose in the debate. If this is true, then all words in the resolution are not important to discuss. Therefore, it is not necessary to discuss the existence of the United States Federal Government since that is not the central question of the resolution.

In addition, the second affirmative speaker would also attack the theoretical basis for the standard of resolutonal competitiveness. The affirmative team argues that this standard of competitiveness collapses the burdens that each counterplan must meet. In other words, one burden of a counterplan is that it must be non-topical. Another separate burden is that it must be competitive. When a negative team claims its counterplan to be competitive on a resolutonal level, all it is claiming is that the counterplan is non-topical. Resolutonal competitiveness is the same as the requirement that counterplans be non-topical, according to the affirmative team. Thus, it
relieves the negative of the necessary burden of proving its counterplan competitive with the affirmative plan, which is unfair to the affirmative team.

The affirmative speaker would also contend that it is not intended for debaters to discuss the agent of change proposed in the resolution. Rather, debates should focus on the action called for in the resolution instead of the agent called upon to perform the action. Since the decentralized socialism counterplan competes only with the agent in the resolution, it does not compete with the resolution as a whole. If the framers of the resolution intended the agent of change to be debated, the resolution would be worded to say, "Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should exist." But the resolution implicitly states that the United States Federal Government which exists should do something. In this way, the negative counterplan does not compete fully with the resolution.

Finally, the second affirmative would claim that this interpretation of the resolution is merely a device that reduces the amount of argumentative clash in the debate. This strategy allows for the negative team to avoid any discussion of specific affirmative plans and harm areas. The same topic would be discussed year after year; whether or not the United States Federal Government should exist. This does not adequately provide the broad exposure to various issues that debate is designed to give to its
participants.

The second negative speaker would respond by arguing that although the phrase, "Resolved: That" is not important, other terms in the resolution are. "Resolved: That" is merely a means of indicating that the topic is worded in the form of a resolution. However, the phrase, "the United States Federal Government" is important to discuss. Therefore, all words in the resolution must be debated.

Also, the second negative would argue that resolutinal competitiveness does not collapse the traditional counterplan burdens. In order for a counterplan to be resolutionally competitive, it must be the opposite of the resolution. It would not suffice, for example, for a counterplan that mandates exploration, and not development of outer space to be claimed as resolutionally competitive with an affirmative plan. Rather, adoption of the counterplan must preclude adoption of the resolution. This standard does not collapse the traditional counterplan burdens.

Finally, the negative team would argue that it is necessary to debate the agent of change, since those words are included in the resolution. There is no reason why the affirmative team has the right to be concerned only with those words that constitute the central question of the resolution. If other terms are included in the topic, they
should be debated. This interpretation of the topic actually increases the amount of argumentative clash in the debate, according to the negative team, because it becomes legitimate to discuss the agent of change as well as the action proposed by the resolution.

The affirmative rebuttalist would respond to each of these negative claims by contending that the topic would be worded differently if the agent of change was to be the focus of the debate. The term "should" is a verb that calls for action. The affirmative team is only required to carry out the action that the resolution calls for. The topic does not say, "Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should exist." Rather the framers present as a given that there is a United States Federal Government. Arguing about whether that agent should exist is begging the question.

The first negative speaker also argues that resolutinal competitiveness is a legitimate standard for judging whether two plans compete because the judge votes for or against the resolution at the end of a debate, not for any specific plan. This view of a judge's role in a debate round assumes that no policy is actually adopted at the end of a debate. Instead, a person, the judge, simply decides whether or not the resolution is a good idea. Therefore, a specific plan is not adopted at the end of a debate round. Because of this, the negative team argues
that resolitional competitiveness is a sufficient test for judging competitiveness of counterplans. Since plans are not relevant, debaters should only be concerned with discussing the value of the resolution as a whole. Therefore, if the decentralized socialism counterplan is competitive with the resolution, it is competitive with the affirmative plan.

In response to this argument, the second affirmative would claim that since it is not the burden of the affirmative team to defend the entire resolution, resolitional competitiveness is not an adequate standard. The second affirmative speaker would claim that the resolution simply serves as a boundary between affirmative-land and negative-land. The affirmative team has the right to choose any area within affirmative-land and defend it as its case. Therefore, the affirmative team need only present one example of the resolution as justification for its adoption overall. Resolitional competitiveness assumes, according to the affirmative team, that the affirmative must defend the entirety of the resolution. Since this is not true, resolitional competitiveness as a standard is not valid.

In rebuttal to this affirmative claim, the second negative speaker would argue that allowing the affirmative team to present simply one example of the resolution allows for the fallacy of hasty generalization to be committed by
the judge. The negative claims that since there are many examples of any resolution, an affirmative team that defends only one of those examples commits a hasty generalization. A sample size of only one is never sufficient to generalize about, but yet this is exactly what the affirmative team is asking the judge to do. Therefore, the affirmative team should defend the entire resolution in order to avoid this fallacy of argumentation. If this is true, then resolutonal competitiveness is a justifiable standard for judging whether two plans compete.

A final affirmative rebuttalist would argue that it is impossible in the debate format to debate about the entire resolution or many examples within that resolution. Time constraints do not allow consideration of all of the possible examples of the resolution. In addition, the affirmative would argue that it is not known at what point a team is able to avoid making a hasty generalization. In other words, how many examples of the resolution must the affirmative team present in order to avoid a hasty generalization? This question is not answered by the negative team.

It is clear, therefore, that the arguments about the competitiveness of a decentralized socialism counterplan are complex. It is argued that the counterplans are competitive based on all five of the traditional standards, but affirmative teams propose some damaging counterarguments to
each of these five standards. The next section of the study will examine the claims for competitiveness for the anarchy counterplan. Many of these claims will be similar to those in favor of the competitiveness of decentralized socialism.

Anarchy

The negative counterplan that mandates a shift to anarchy is in many ways similar to a counterplan that mandates decentralized socialism for the United States. However, since the plans proposed in each case are different, the claims for competitiveness of each of these counterplans are different as well. This section of the study will explain how the five standards of competitiveness would be used in an actual debate round to justify an anarchy counterplan.

Mutual Exclusivity

Initially, the first negative speaker argues that anarchy is mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan. He or she argues that it is physically impossible to have law and no law at the same time. Since the affirmative plan is a law, it is competitive with the counterplan. Also, the first negative argues that anarchy is the complete denial of government, while the affirmative advocates government action. It is impossible to have no government and to use government to act at the same time. For these reasons, the negative team argues that the anarchy counterplan is
A second affirmative speaker would deny these claims by arguing first that the affirmative plan is not necessarily a law that will be adopted at the end of the debate round. In fact, in a true sense, no action is taken at all. The judge only decides whether or not the resolution is a good idea, and no policy action is taken. It is therefore physically possible to consider both options, since anarchy only negate law and government, not ideas.

In addition, the affirmative team would contend that since its plan is only an idea instead of a policy, it does not necessarily uphold the value of government. For example, if the topic is, Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should increase exploration and development of outer space, the affirmative team would argue that its plan only claims that someone should develop and explore outer space. Governmental action is not called for in the specific affirmative plan, even though such action may be called for in the resolution, and thus the counterplan is perhaps competitive with the resolution, but not with the plan.

In addition, the affirmative team could challenge the claim that anarchy is the complete denial of government. In the advantages section of the defense of the anarchy counterplan in the previous chapter, it is argued that under anarchy, a loose federation of communes would form a type of
government, albeit not a highly bureaucratic one. However, the fact that even a loose federation could exist in a state of anarchy proves that anarchy is not the complete negation of government. Rather, it is a call for a different type of government. Therefore, the counterplan is not mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan.

Finally, the second affirmative speaker would propose a re-plan in order to test the competitiveness of the counterplan. Since the resolution assumes that the United States Federal Government exists, and since the negative team proposes to change that assumption, the affirmative can re-plan to account for the change in assumptions. The second affirmative speaker in this case would argue that the affirmative plan now is considered to exist in a state of anarchy, and someone in that ideal world decides that it is a good idea to explore and develop outer space. In this way, the second affirmative speaker attempts to force the negative team to discuss whether or not outer space should be developed, instead of who should rule, if anyone at all. In these ways, the affirmative team argues that the counterplan and the plan are not mutually exclusive.

In response, the second negative speaker would argue first of all that if it is true that the affirmative plan is only an idea for the judge to consider, so is the negative counterplan. The affirmative idea advocates that the United States Federal Government should do something, and the
negative counter-idea advocates that there should be no government at all. In this pure sense, then, the two ideas are mutually exclusive. One cannot logically believe that the government should act and should be abolished at the same time.

In addition, the negative speaker would claim that the affirmative plan is indeed legislation, since it is worded as legislation and has enforcement provisions. Anarchy's main complaint against modern government is the use of coercion to enforce the law. Therefore, since the affirmative plan contains enforcement provisions and does not rely on voluntary cooperation, it is the opposite of anarchy and is mutually exclusive with the counterplan.

The next argument the second negative speaker must address is the claim that the affirmative team does not uphold the value of government, and therefore, the counterplan does not compete with the affirmative plan. The negative team would argue that since the words "the United States Federal Government" are in the resolution that the affirmative team is supporting, the affirmative does support the value of government. Whether or not those words appear in the affirmative plan is irrelevant; the affirmative is bound to support the resolution, and the resolution is the opposite of anarchy.

The affirmative team also claims that anarchy advocates a loose federation to guide behavior, and consequently, it
does not represent the complete negation of government. The second negative speaker would deny this by arguing that the loose federation is not a form of government, since it has no power to make or enforce laws. Rather, this loose federation is similar to a conference or convention to discuss and debate important issues. No decisions are made, and the emphasis is on voluntarism and cooperation. Therefore, this loose federation would not be able to adopt the affirmative plan under the system of anarchy. Since the affirmative plan requires government and coercion to achieve its advantages, it can not be accomplished in an anarchist society.

Finally, the second negative speaker would address the affirmative proposal to re-plan. As in the case of the decentralized socialism counterplan, the second negative would claim that the strategy of re-planning is not legitimate in academic debate since it allows the affirmative team to change its plan in the course of the debate round, and the theory of re-planning is not yet developed or accepted. In addition, the negative team would argue that even if the re-plan strategy were legitimate, it would not be feasible in an anarchist society. For example, the negative could argue that the exploration and development of space requires a large government bureaucracy to oversee and implement the specific plans. No individual or group of individuals would be able to accomplish this
feat in a system of anarchy. Therefore, it would still be physically impossible to adopt the affirmative plan in an anarchist society.

To rebuild its case against mutual exclusivity, the final affirmative speaker would attempt to synthesize all of the arguments and come up with conclusions that justify voting for the affirmative plan instead of the counterplan. Initially, the affirmative team would argue that if it is accepted that the affirmative and negative plans are not laws but rather ideas to be considered by the judge, they can coexist. Again, the affirmative team would claim that the central question of the resolution is whether or not outer space should be developed. In no way does this idea clash with the idea that our society should become anarchistic. In other words, the affirmative argues that the judge needs to consider the affirmative idea independently of the agent specified in the resolution. Since the agent is an assumption of the resolution, it is not intended to be debated anyway.

This same distinction between the agent of the resolution and the action called for by the resolution would be made by the final affirmative speaker when arguing that the affirmative team does not uphold the value of government in society. All the affirmative team is required to do is to support the action called for in the resolution, not the agent used to accomplish that action. In this sense, then,
the counterplan is not mutually exclusive with the affirmative idea.

The question of whether or not an anarchist society contains a loose form of government would be addressed next. The affirmative team might grant that it is true that anarchy needs no government, since all individuals share in a feeling of cooperation and voluntarism. If this claim is true, then it would be possible to adopt the affirmative plan under a system of anarchy. No enforcement provisions would be needed for the affirmative plan if it was adopted in a society that emphasized cooperation and voluntarism. The citizens would be enlightened about the benefits of the affirmative plan and would cooperate in making it reality. In this way, the re-plan proposed by the affirmative team gains credence. If the judge believes the claims that anarchy is a perfectly cooperative society, there is no reason why the affirmative plan cannot be modified so that it is adopted in such a society.

Also, if the negative team is correct in arguing that the affirmative plan could not be adopted under a system of anarchy because the exploration and development of space requires a huge bureaucracy, then the negative team's claim that the counterplan is competitive based on the standard of redundancy is false. If space exploration and development is impossible under anarchy, then the counterplan cannot achieve the affirmative advantages. In this way, the
The affirmative team argues that the plans are not mutually exclusive. Of course, the affirmative speaker would also need to justify the theoretical basis for the strategy of re-planning, as was true for the decentralized socialism counterplan, and argue that it is a legitimate form of argumentation. Overall, the affirmative rebuttalist would claim that the counterplan is not mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan.

**Net Benefits**

The next form of competitiveness to consider is the net benefits standard. The negative team argues that it would not be beneficial to adopt anarchy in conjunction with any form of government because anarchy is absolutist in its rejection of government. Therefore, any government present in an anarchist society would undermine the advantages of anarchy. In addition, the negative team would argue that incremental steps to achieve anarchy would also fail. We need a fast and total transition if our anarchist society of the future is to succeed.

In response, the second affirmative speaker would claim that the argument of absolutism proves that the anarchy counterplan is vastly overinclusive, and thus its advantages are all extra-competitive. It is to be remembered that the negative team can only claim advantages from portions of its plan that compete directly with the affirmative plan. This sense of enlightenment and cooperation achieved through
anarchy is not competitive with the affirmative plan, and therefore all of its benefits are extra-competitive. In addition, the second affirmative speaker would contend that the benefits of anarchy are not relevant to a decision over whether or not outer space should be developed and explored. In this sense, also, the counterplan advantages are extra-competitive.

Whether or not anarchy can be achieved incrementally would also be addressed by the second affirmative speaker. He or she would argue that the affirmative team does not advocate an incremental approach. Rather, the affirmative team advocates adoption of both plans since they are mutually supportive of each other. In other words, the affirmative could argue that the peaceful exploration and development of outer space could aid in the transition to anarchy since it may teach mankind that the earth and its natural environment are worth saving from destruction. In this way, the affirmative argues that it would be better to adopt both anarchy and the affirmative plan at the same time.

The second negative would first respond to the claim that the advantages of the counterplan are extra-competitive. He or she would argue that the advantages of anarchy occur as a direct result of the absence of government. Therefore, since the absence of government competes directly with the affirmative system
that mandates the use of the government, the advantages are not extra-competitive. In addition, similar to the decentralized socialism counterplan, the negative team would argue that it was intended for debaters to argue about the agent of change as well as the action called for by the resolution. Therefore, it is illegitimate for the affirmative team to ignore the agent of change and focus only on the value of space exploration and development. When the agent is considered, the counterplans do directly compete. The benefits of anarchy cannot come about if government is present.

The second negative would also contend that a government program to explore and develop outer space would not aid the transition to anarchy, but rather would hinder it. Since the affirmative plan requires the continuation and indeed strengthening of the United States Federal Government, it cannot in any sense aid in the development an anarchist society on earth.

To rebuild the case against net benefits, the final affirmative rebuttalist would argue first that the agent of change once again is assumed, and is not to be debated. In addition, the affirmative would claim that the negative counterplan is extra-competitive because it ignores the affirmative harm area and proposes action totally unrelated to the affirmative area or the resolution as a whole. If it is true, that the agent of change is not debatable, then the
counterplan is extra-competitive. Finally, the affirmative speaker would argue that a system of government is not needed to explore and develop outer space if it is assumed that society is anarchist and committed to cooperation and voluntarism. Thus, it would be better to adopt both plans at the same time to achieve maximum benefits. In this way, the discussion about whether the counterplan is net beneficial would take place, and eventually the judge would weigh the advantages and disadvantages of both plans to decide which would be the most beneficial to adopt.

**Philosophical Competitiveness**

The next standard of competitiveness used to justify the anarchy counterplan is philosophical competitiveness. The first negative argues that the philosophies of anarchy and government are opposites, and since the affirmative team uses government, it is philosophically opposed to the negative team's call for anarchy. The affirmative speaker would deny this claim in two ways. First, as argued earlier, the affirmative team does not necessarily embrace the idea of government, just the idea that outer space should be developed. Second, the affirmative could argue that anarchy and law do not necessarily compete philosophically. For example, a law that deregulates the sale of natural gas, or deregulates the airline industry is not a law that strengthens the power of government. Rather, this law would reduce the level of government influence in
society. Therefore, it is not necessarily true that anarchy and legislation are philosophically opposed. Deregulation laws are a good example to prove that this is the case. Finally, the affirmative team would argue once again that the claim of philosophical competitiveness lies with the agent of change in the resolution, which is not to be debated. To respond to these arguments, the second negative would first argue that the affirmative team does embrace the philosophy of government since they support the resolution which upholds government. Second, the negative would claim that the example of deregulation as a type of law still negates the idea of anarchy. The very fact that a law with enforcement provisions needs to be passed to deregulate an industry indicates that our society is necessarily involved with government, and that the laws encouraging deregulation still contain enforcement provisions and are based on coercion. In addition, it is not good enough to rely on such incremental measures, when the real change needed is a drastic one to anarchy. Also, the negative team would support its claim that the agent of change should be debated, similar to that claim in the case of the decentralized socialism counterplan.

Finally, the affirmative rebuttalist would argue against each of these claims by contending that in a pure sense, the philosophy of supporting space development does not compete with the philosophy of anarchy. This question
is the only one that needs to be addressed in the debate round, since the agent is an assumption that is not to be debated. Again, if it was intended for debaters to discuss the agent of change, the resolution would say that the United States Federal Government should exist. In this way, the affirmative team would argue that the plan and the counter-system counterplan do not compete on a philosophical level.

**Redundancy**

Judging the competitiveness of the two plans on the basis of redundancy again depends on the specific advantages claimed by the affirmative and negative teams. The affirmative team would make reference to its cross-application, in which it is argued by the negative team that exploration and development of space requires a government bureaucracy, and therefore cannot be accomplished in a state of anarchy. If this is true, the counterplan does not meet the competitiveness standard of redundancy, since it cannot achieve the specific affirmative advantages from developing outer space. Also, the affirmative would argue that duplicative actions are not necessarily bad, if the two plans could be coordinated to avoid waste and overlapping authority. The negative would attempt to defeat each of these claims
in the same way it would for the socialism counterplan.

Resolutional Competitiveness

Finally, the negative would claim that the anarchy counterplan competes with the resolution as a whole, and thus with the affirmative plan that is an example of the resolution. Again, the same arguments presented for decentralized socialism would be used here. The affirmative would argue that it is illegitimate to discuss the existence of the agent of change in the resolution. The debate resolution would be worded differently if this was intended. The negative would again bolster its claim that since the agent is included in the resolution, it should be discussed. Again, whether or not resolutional competitiveness collapses the traditional counterplan burdens would be discussed. The arguments for and against resolutional competitiveness for the anarchy counterplan would be the same as those for and against resolutional competitiveness for the decentralized socialism counterplan.

Overall, this is the way that competitiveness of anarchy as a counter-system counterplan would be debated. Both teams would justify the theoretical basis for the standards they choose to discuss and each team would attempt to prove that their claims regarding
the issue of competitiveness are superior. The next section of the study will consider the world government counterplan and how the issue of competitiveness would be debated in that case.

World Government

The negative team that proposes world government as a solution to the problems of the world argues that it is competitive with affirmative plans based on all five traditional standards for judging competitiveness. This portion of the study will summarize the arguments for each of these standards for both the affirmative and the negative team. Again, the claims for many of these standards of competitiveness are similar to those for socialism and anarchy.

Mutual Exclusivity

First, the negative team would argue that its world government counterplan is competitive with the affirmative plan because it is mutually exclusive with the plan. The first negative would argue that national actions crowd out international actions, and therefore, the judge must choose between national and international policies. It is physically impossible for the United States Federal Government and a world government to exist at the same time. In addition, the negative would claim that incremental approaches to developing a just world order fail, and only
drastic solutions will succeed in preventing world annihilation.

The second affirmative would approach the question of mutual exclusivity of the world government counterplan similarly to the socialism and anarchy counterplans. He or she would propose a permutation of the two plans that consists of having a federal world government made up of independent states. The independent state currently known as the United States Federal Government would then act to increase the development and exploration of outer space, for example.

In addition, the second affirmative might choose the strategy of re-planning to account for the change in assumptions proposed by the negative team. A federal world government would be adopted, and then that government would adopt the affirmative plan by increasing the development of outer space in the direction the original affirmative plan proposes. Again, the theory of re-planning would be explained and justified. The affirmative would argue that since the assumptions of the resolution are not debatable, the re-plan is legitimate.

The affirmative team would also contend that adoption of the two plans is possible, based on the above claims, and that it would be better to adopt both plans. The exploration and development of space could pave the way for acceptance of a federal world government by creating a sense
of global consciousness that would facilitate the transition to the new system. In this way, the second affirmative would claim that the two plans are not mutually exclusive.

In response to these arguments, the second negative speaker would argue that the proposed permutation would not be possible. The federal world government is successful only if the entire system of state sovereignty is eliminated. If the United States Federal Government is allowed the power to develop outer space, power would be denied the federal world government. Allowing the United States Federal Government to exist supports the entire system of state sovereignty and therefore undermines world government. This action would deny the value of the transition to a world government in the first place. Also, the negative team would indict the theory of permutations, claiming it is unfair to the negative and illegitimate.

In response to the proposed re-plan, the negative team would again deny the theoretical validity of the strategy. In addition, the negative would argue that the affirmative plan is designed for the benefit of one nation, the United States, and therefore would undermine the world order values necessary for the transition to a world government. Also, the negative team could argue here that it is the burden of the affirmative team to justify the placement of each term in the resolution. Since the affirmative is bound to defend the resolution, they are responsible for defending the
necessity of using the United States Federal Government. By proposing a re-plan, the affirmative team does not uphold its burden of justifying each term in the resolution, and in fact, the affirmative is actually denying the validity of the term "the United States Federal Government." In this way, the negative speaker would argue that the affirmative team has failed to justify the resolution.

To respond to the affirmative claim that its plan would pave the way for an easy transition to the world government system, the negative speaker would contend that it is illegitimate to argue that one plan should be adopted before the other. Again, it must be assumed that the two plans are adopted simultaneously in order for the test of competitiveness to be fair to both teams. Otherwise, the affirmative team would always win the debate. Only by considering the two plans at the same time is the test of competitiveness truly rigorous.

The affirmative rebuttalist would answer each of these claims by rebuilding and extending the original affirmative arguments concerning competitiveness. First, the affirmative speaker would argue that the proposed permutation would not undermine the system of world government if the international governing body is merely a coordinating organization that manages international conflict and allows for decentralized decision making at the nation-state level. In this type of a world government
system, individual states would be able to act, as long as their actions were accountable to the international coordinating body. This permutation would achieve the maximum benefits of both the affirmative and the negative plans.

To defend the affirmative re-plan, the rebuttalist would contend that the world order values of the world government would not be undermined, since the affirmative plan would operate under all of the modified assumptions of the new system. If the world order values were assumed to be a part of the new world government, the affirmative plan would not violate the assumptions since it would be adopted with them in mind. In addition, the affirmative rebuttalist would argue that the justification argument presented by the negative team is not true, since the affirmative is not forced to defend the assumptions of the resolution. Since the agent of change is an assumption of the resolution, it need not be justified by the affirmative team.

Finally, in response to the negative claim that it must be assumed that the two plans are adopted simultaneously, the affirmative rebuttalist might agree that this is the case, and argue that the two plans can be adopted simultaneously. The benefits of global consciousness would still be achieved, and help pave the way towards a federal world government. This is the way the discussion about whether or not world government is mutually exclusive with
the affirmative plan would take place.

**Net Benefits**

The next standard of competitiveness to consider is net benefits. Once again, this discussion is similar to those for socialism and anarchy. The negative team argues that it is better to adopt world government alone since the state system itself is responsible for all the problems of the world. The affirmative would argue that the advantages claimed by the negative team are extra-competitive since they do not deal with space development and do not stem from parts of the negative plan that directly compete with the affirmative plan. The negative would claim in response that its plan competes directly with the agent of change in the resolution, and thus the advantages from changing that agent are not extra-competitive. Again, the affirmative would argue that the agent is an assumption of the resolution that is not to be debated in the round. In this way, the issue of net benefits of the counterplan is debated.

**Philosophical Competitiveness**

In terms of the standard of philosophical competitiveness, the negative team argues that the affirmative plan upholds the philosophy of state sovereignty and the counterplan denies the validity of that philosophy. The negative team argues that the belief in state sovereignty inhibits the transition to world government, and
since the affirmative embraces that philosophy, it is inconsistent with the philosophy of the counterplan.

The second affirmative speaker would argue that the affirmative plan does not in any way bolster the philosophy of state sovereignty. Rather, it just upholds the assumption of the resolution that state sovereignty exists in the world today. Therefore, the affirmative plan itself does not inhibit the philosophy of global sovereignty. Also, the affirmative could argue that the two philosophies do not actually compete, since in the current world order, sovereign states exist, and international law to coordinate relations between these sovereign states also exists. This example proves that national and international law can coexist.

The second negative speaker would contend that even if the affirmative team does not advocate strengthening the system of state sovereignty, it does advocate the continuation of that system since it uses the United States Federal Government as its agent of action. Since this is the case, the affirmative supports state sovereignty as it currently exists, and the counterplan advocates the elimination of states. Therefore, the two philosophies compete with one another. Also, the negative team would argue that the example of international law proving that the two philosophies can coexist actually supports the negative position. International law in the present world order
recognizes the right of state sovereignty, and therefore
does not represent a break with that philosophy. The
counterplan, on the other hand, advocates a complete shift
from sovereignty to world order.

The final affirmative rebuttalist would deny these
arguments by contending first that the affirmative is
not, once again, required to support the agent of
change in the resolution, since is it merely an
assumption of the resolution. Also, the affirmative
would argue that its plan is not analogous to the
current system of international law, since it does not
either codify or deny the existence of state
sovereignty. The affirmative plan is merely an idea,
and it is irrelevant which agent of action decides to
adopt that idea.

Redundancy

The claim for redundancy of the counterplan and
the affirmative plan once again depends on the specific
advantages claimed by each team. However, the
affirmative team would again deny the validity of the
standard of redundancy by arguing that it could be
beneficial to adopt two plans to achieve the maximum
benefits of both. This is similar to the arguments
made by the affirmative team debating whether the
United States should be a socialist nation or an
Finally, the last reason why a world government counterplan is competitive with an affirmative plan is that it is competitive with the resolution as a whole. Similar to socialism and anarchy as counterplans, the affirmative and negative teams would discuss whether resolitional competitiveness collapses the traditional burdens a counterplan must meet, and whether or not the agent of change is intended to be debated. Again, these arguments are spelled out in the section of the study dealing with resolitional competitiveness of the socialism counterplan.

Overall, the defense of competitiveness for the world government counterplan is basically the same as the defense for socialism and anarchy. As a result, the affirmative arguments in this case are also similar to those presented in the discussion of socialism and anarchy. In conclusion, through this method of conducting a debate round in print, several important questions concerning the competitiveness of counter-system counterplans emerge. First, it is clear that the key to determining whether or not these counterplans are competitive depends on the question of whether or not the assumptions of the resolution are debatable. Are debaters only intended to discuss the terms...
in the resolution that comprise the central question of the topic, and if so, why might this be true? If the resolution was worded to say that "the United States Federal Government should be strengthened to explore and develop outer space," would the counter-system counterplans be competitive? These questions will be addressed in the next portion of the study.

Another important question that emerges from this discussion is whether or not it is wise to debate the agent of change proposed in the debate resolution. Of course, this question is related to whether or not the assumptions of the resolution are debatable. But on a more pragmatic level, if counter-system counterplans are not considered legitimate because they propose a different agent of change, the legitimacy of counter-agent counterplans such as those that propose state government action rather than federal government action is questioned as well. These issues will also be addressed in the next portion of the study.

Finally, the issue of whether permutations and re-planning are legitimate strategies emerges. How is the judge to determine whether or not negative advantages are extra-competitive? Should this judgment be made on the basis of whether the negative counterplan competes with the agent of change or the action called for by the resolution? Is permutation a legitimate affirmative strategy? Is re-planning a legitimate affirmative response to
counter-system counterplans? These questions will be addressed in the next portion of the study.
Notes

1 Claremont McKenna College defeated Loyola Marymount University in an elimination round of the 1984 Glen R. Capp Invitational Debate Tournament at Baylor University by employing the strategy of affirmative re-planning. The author was present at the tournament.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Whether counter-system counterplans are competitive with affirmative plans is a complex and interesting question. In numerous debate rounds each year, affirmative and negative speakers argue about whether these counterplans are legitimately competitive substitutes for affirmative plans. Affirmative options to defeat counter-system counterplans range from challenging the fairness of the strategy to arguing that they are not competitive. Some affirmative teams choose to accept the legitimacy of the counterplans and modify the affirmative plans to account for them by proposing a re-plan. The focus of this study is the issue of competitiveness. Up to this point, it is established that five standards are used by debate participants to determine whether counterplans are competitive. If the two plans are mutually exclusive, if the negative counterplan is net beneficial, if the two plans are philosophically opposed, if the two plans are redundant, or if the counterplan competes with the resolution as a whole, the counterplan is considered competitive. It is also established that several questions about competitiveness of counter-system counterplans remain
unanswered when these five standards are applied. What are the assumptions of the debate resolution, and how can they be recognized? Is it intended for debaters to discuss the assumptions? Should the agent of change specified in the resolution be debated? Are the affirmative strategies of proposing permutations and re-plans effective responses to counter-system counterplans? This section of the study answers these questions, and in so doing, proposes modifications and additions to counterplan theory to account for counter-system counterplans. It should be noted at the outset that since this study is concerned with whether counter-system counterplans are competitive in general, no attempt is made to compare them to specific affirmative plans. Rather, the counterplans will be viewed in comparison to various debate resolutions.

The first question that remains unanswered by current counterplan theory is whether the assumptions of the resolution are to be debated. Initially, it is necessary to determine what parts of the specific resolution constitute assumptions. The key to locating the assumptions of the resolution is to find the nouns in the sentence. Those nouns constitute the assumptions of the sentence. For example, assume the topic is, Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should significantly increase exploration and development of outer space. The nouns in the sentence are "the United States Federal Government", 

"exploration and development," and "outer space." These are assumptions because they are offered as givens that exist: there is a United States Federal Government, exploration and development currently exist, and outer space exists. The resolution calls for action to be taken regarding these assumptions. Another example will help illustrate. Suppose the topic is, Resolved: That all United States military intervention into the internal affairs of any foreign nation or nations in the Western Hemisphere should be prohibited. It is assumed that United States military intervention exists; that internal affairs exist; and that foreign nations in the Western Hemisphere exist. Finally, assume the topic, is Resolved: That any and all injury resulting from the disposal of hazardous waste in the United States should be the legal responsibility of the producer of that waste. It is assumed that there is such a thing as a "hazardous waste," and that there is a producer of that waste, among other assumptions. Therefore, the assumptions of the resolution are the nouns in the sentence. When debate resolutions are written, these words are chosen as referents to items, events or institutions in the real world that exist. The resolution proposes that something should be done to or with these items, events or institutions.

But is it the case that all of these assumptions are not debatable? For example, referring to the military intervention topic noted above, if "military intervention"
is an assumption, and all assumptions are not debatable, how can an affirmative team legitimately argue that military intervention should be prohibited? The key to solving this problem lies in finding the central question of the resolution. In a proposition of policy, action is called for. In other words, a debate resolution calls for something to be done, some action to be taken. Therefore, the central question asked by a debate resolution is, "what should be done?" Once this is established, the specific resolution can be restated to reveal the central question.

In terms of the outer space topic, the restatement of the resolution is, "what should be significantly increased?" The answer to this question is "exploration and development of outer space." Thus, the central question of the resolution is whether exploration and development of outer space should be significantly increased. For the military intervention topic, the restatement is, "what should be prohibited?" The answer is "United States military intervention into the internal affairs of foreign nations in the Western Hemisphere." Finally, for the hazardous waste topic, the restatement is, "what should be the legal responsibility of the producer of hazardous waste?" The answer is "injury that results from the disposal of that waste."

Through this method, the central question of the debate resolution can be discovered. This central question is what
the framers of the resolution intended to be debated; whether or not outer space should be explored and developed, or whether or not military intervention should be prohibited. The answer to the question "what should be done" indicates which assumptions are debatable. But what if the resolution is worded so that the central question calls for two actions to be taken? For example, assume the topic is, Resolved: That an international organization should be established for the development and allocation of scarce world resources. What is to be established? An international organization is to be established. But this topic goes one step further; for what purpose should an international organization be established? For the purpose of developing and allocating scarce world resources. In this example, there are two central questions in the resolution; whether an international organization should be established, and whether this international organization should develop and allocate scarce world resources. The debaters are allowed, in this case, to discuss whether or not the agent, an international organization, should exist. If the outer space topic was worded to say that "the United States Federal Government should be strengthened for the exploration and development of outer space," then the question of whether or not the United States Federal Government should be strengthened is debatable, and whether space should be explored and developed is also debatable.
But if the resolution is not worded in such a way as to call for two policy actions, debating assumptions not included in the central question is illegitimate. Arguing that the United States Federal Government should not exist begs the central question of whether or not outer space should be developed. Arguing that hazardous waste should not exist begs the central question of who should be responsible for injuries that result from hazardous waste. Arguing that scarce world resources should not exist begs the central question of whether they should be allocated and developed by an international organization.

Therefore, the solution to the problem of determining what assumptions of the resolution are debatable is to search for the central question or questions of the policy proposition. Those assumptions which answer the central questions are debatable. But why is the answer to the question of who should act not debatable? Why is it illegitimate to argue that the United States Federal Government should not explore and develop outer space, because it should not exist? The answer to this question can be found by returning to traditional counterplan theory. This problem of whether or not the agent of change should be debated will be considered next.

Debating agents of change involves many of the same issues as debating assumptions of the resolution because agents of change usually are assumptions. But negative
teams argue that if an agent of change is specified in the resolution, it should be debated. Perhaps this is true, but the question to be asked, then, is how agents of change should be debated. The previous discussion establishes that the central question or questions of the resolution are the only ones to be debated. This finding can aid in resolving whether agents of change should be debated.

If the central question is "what should be done," is it legitimate for the negative team to claim that "what should be done by whom" is debatable? The answer to this question is yes. It is legitimate for the negative team to argue, for example, that private industry, rather than the United States Federal Government, should explore and develop outer space, or that a world government should explore and develop outer space. But when the negative team argues only that a world government should exist, they fail to deny the central question of the resolution. Rather, they are debating the proposition, Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should exist. The entire central question of the resolution, whether or not outer space should be explored and developed, is not addressed in this negative counterplan. In other words, the negative counterplan that simply replaces the United States Federal Government with a different system, and claims general advantages from the alternative system, does not compete with the central question of the resolution.
However, if the negative team was to argue that its alternative system of government would better answer the central question of the resolution, it would be legitimate. For example, under the outer space topic, a negative counterplan that mandates a transition to world government and claims general advantages to world government would not be competitive. But a negative counterplan that establishes a world government and mandates that it take action to increase exploration and development of outer space and claims the advantage that a world government would better accomplish the goal of space exploration and development, would be legitimate. This notion relates to the traditional view of negative counterplans, namely that in order to be legitimate, they must achieve the affirmative advantages. If a reasonable assumption is that the framers of the debate resolution intend a different topic to be discussed each year, then this requirement that counter-system counterplans address the central question of the resolution is sound. If counter-system counterplans that claim vastly overinclusive advantages are considered legitimate negative strategies, then the resolution each year is reduced to whether or not the United States Federal Government should exist. Requiring that counter-system counterplans be germane to the resolution preserves the potential for argumentative clash on the central question of the resolution.

This requirement that counter-system counterplans be
germane to the central question of the resolution is also sound when applied to counter-agent counterplans. If the debate resolution is, Resolved: That the United States Federal Government should provide comprehensive job training programs for all impoverished citizens, a negative team could propose a counterplan calling for the fifty states, each independently according to its own needs, to train the poor rather than the federal government. As long as the counter-agent counterplan only claims advantages germane to the central question, it is legitimately competitive. The same is true for counterplans that call for private enterprise or non-profit foundation action in the place of the federal government. As long as advantages are germane, the counterplans are competitive. Although counter-agent counterplans are similar to counter-system counterplans in that they propose that an agent other than the federal government should act, they differ in that advocating state government or foundation action does not call for abolishing the federal government. Therefore, counter-agent counterplans do not deny that the federal government should exist; that assumption remains intact.

Another important question is whether or not the affirmative strategies of proposing permutations and re-plans are helpful in judging competitiveness of counter-system counterplans. It should be noted that proposing a permutation of an affirmative plan and a
counterplan does not constitute amending the affirmative plan. Permutations are simply means of theoretically testing to see if the two plans are mutually exclusive. The affirmative posits that it is theoretically possible for the two plans to be combined in a specific fashion, and therefore, they are not mutually exclusive. In other words, permutations attempt to find different ways that the affirmative and negative plans can fit together. If it is determined that they do not fit together, perhaps they are mutually exclusive.

Permutations can be helpful in determining whether counter-system counterplans are addressing the central question of the resolution. The purpose of proposing a permutation is to determine if the plans can be combined in such a fashion as to achieve the benefits of both. If the advantages claimed by the negative counterplan are overinclusive, it is possible for the two plans to be combined. If the advantages are not, the plans can not be combined. For example, assume the affirmative team proposes to increase exploration and development of outer space. The negative team presents a counterplan that establishes a world government. The advantages of the world government counterplan are promoting nuclear disarmament and ending world hunger. The affirmative would argue that it is possible to explore and develop outer space, promote disarmament and end world hunger all at the same time. If,
however, the advantage of the negative counterplan was that national governments cannot effectively develop space, and a world government would better accomplish that task, this directly competes with the affirmative claim that the United States Federal Government should develop outer space. Thus, through considering permutations of the plan and counterplan, the debaters and judge can determine which advantages are extra-competitive and consequently not germane to the central question of the resolution.

Finally, the question of whether re-planning is an effective strategy needs to be answered. As noted earlier, re-planning is an affirmative strategy that proposes to grant the negative team's claim that an alternative system of government is superior and then modify the affirmative plan to account for this change in the frame of reference. Re-planning is similar to permutations in that it attempts to show that in a pure sense, the two plans can coexist. But the strategy of proposing a re-plan goes one step further, and consequently is risky for the affirmative team. If the affirmative team completely abandons the assumption that the United States Federal government exists, and if it agrees that another system of government should replace it, it has failed to meet its burden of justifying all of the terms in the resolution.

The affirmative team is required to argue, if challenged, that each term in the resolution is the best
possible term that could have been chosen. For example, if the topic states that the producer of hazardous waste should be responsible for injuries that result from its disposal, the affirmative team would have to uphold the value of holding the producer of the waste responsible. If the negative team won an argument claiming that the producer was not negligent since the federal government does not have regulations for these toxins, and therefore the federal government, and not the producer should be responsible, the negative team would win the debate. The affirmative team must be prepared to justify why each term should appear in the debate resolution.

As a result, if an affirmative team re-plans as a strategy against a counter-system counterplan, it accepts the fact that the phrase "the United States Federal Government" is not justified. If the negative team made this argument, the affirmative team would lose the debate for failing to justify the resolution. The affirmative team would probably argue that it has not failed to justify the resolution, since the negative team changed the assumptions of the resolution. If the assumptions are changed, the affirmative team has the right to change its plan to meet these assumptions. Clearly, more theoretical work is needed on the strategy of re-planning. Whether re-planning is legitimate or relieves the affirmative of its burden to justify the resolution needs to be addressed with further
This study concludes that counter-system counterplans are only legitimately competitive with affirmative plans if they answer "yes" to the central question of the resolution. This central question is determined by asking what action the resolution calls for, and in some cases, for what purpose that action should be taken. Judges and affirmative teams can test counter-system counterplans by visualizing possible permutations of the affirmative plan and the counterplan to determine if they could coexist without jeopardizing the benefits of each. This conclusion represents a return to traditional debate theory, which claims that the negative counterplan must achieve the affirmative plan's advantages. However, this conclusion differs from traditional debate theory in that it only requires the counterplan to be germane to the resolution as a whole, rather than the specific affirmative plan.

In addition, this study concludes that counterplans which discuss the agent of change specified in the resolution are legitimate if one of two conditions is met. First, if the counterplan adopts a new agent of change for the purposes of affirming the central question of the resolution, or in other words, if it is germane to the resolution, it is legitimate. Second, counter-system counterplans are legitimately competitive if the resolution contains two central questions; one that claims an agent of
change should be established or strengthened and one that claims a policy action should be taken. Again, however, the counterplan may only claim advantages that are related to the central question of the resolution. It may not claim overinclusive advantages.

Finally, this study concludes that counter-system counterplans as currently conceived by most negative teams do not meet the "traditional" standard of competitiveness; they do not solve the harm isolated by the affirmative team. Through the tests of finding the central question of the resolution and permutations, however, debaters and judges can determine whether or not this is the case for any specific counterplan. In addition, this study concludes that counter-system counterplans meet the "contemporary" standards of competitiveness frequently used in debate rounds (mutual exclusivity, net benefits, redundancy, philosophical competitiveness, and resolutional competitiveness) if they are germane to the debate resolution. If they simply prove that the federal government should not exist, they are not legitimately competitive based on these standards. In addition, further research is needed in the evolution of counterplan theory in academic debate. Specifically, a theoretical investigation of the affirmative strategy of re-planning is needed to determine if it is legitimate. Also, the ongoing reassessment of the standard of net benefits needs to
continue. Since this standard encourage negative debaters to formulate counterplans with extra-competitive advantages in order to prove that their plan is net beneficial, it should be studied in depth. Finally, theoretical work concerning the standard of resolutional competitiveness is needed. There is some question as to whether this standard is a legitimate one for judging counterplan competitiveness, and scholarly research can help to clarify these questions. Future scholars should address these problems so that formal debate theory will no longer lag behind actual practice in academic debate, a situation which led to the need for the present study.
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