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Reading Tribe and other critics, one is left with a strong sense that utilitarianism and cost-benefit analysis are flawed — and are to be rejected — because of their callousness towards the individual, his rights, and the processes by which those rights are exercised. ‘‘The notion of human rights,” as Steven Kelman puts it in his recent “ethical critique” of cost-benefit analysis, “involves the idea that people may make certain claims to be allowed to act in certain ways or to be treated in certain ways, even if the sum of benefits achieved thereby does not outweigh the sum of costs.” A right is not something that can be assigned on “efficiency’’ grounds; a right is precisely an individual’s ‘trump’”2 against the claims of efficiency, his protection against social “utility monsters” like the one that recently devoured the Poletown section of Detroit.13 The problem with cost-benefit analysis, we are encouraged to believe, is that, in reducing social questions to the common metric of a homogenized utility, it treats human beings — and their historically rich and idiosyncratic circumstances — with insufficient respect.

A. Interpretation

Spreading is a strategic tool to use speed while speaking and/or number of arguments in hopes of forcing an opponent to miss refuting and/or under-refuting arguments to claim drops/concessions that win the debate. It is a form of rhetorical and structural exclusion- especially for those with disabilities that disallow them from playing that form of the debate “game”.

1. Violation

My opponent presented their arguments both in number and in presentation that disallow me to respond to everything that they presented. They are rhetorically and argumentatively excluding me from this form of debate

1. Standards
2. Fairness
3. Education
4. Limits

Limiting the speed of delivery and the number of arguments is necessary to ensure the best clash in the round. Deeper clash over a smaller number of areas is what makes debate important and different from other forensics events. Spreading may give us more information but deeper clash is what makes debate educational.

#### **Depth outweighs breadth – studies overwhelmingly vote neg – key to education**

TPC (Texas Panhandle P-16 Council, Texas-based group of teachers and educators from across the state) 2010 “Breadth vs. Depth of High School Curriculum Content” http://www.panhandlep-16.net/users/0001/docs/Position%20Paper2.pdf

Less breadth and more depth in curriculum better prepares students for future careers and education. This is the position of over one hundred faculty assembled in the Texas Panhandle, and it is also the conclusion of many scholarly studies reviewed for this paper. In fact, there are far too many studies to cite in this paper, so only a few representative studies are used. In a 2008 study entitled “Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Science Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework”1 the researchers noted: “In a comparison of 46 countries, Schmidt et al. (2005) noted that in top-achieving countries, the science frameworks cover far fewer topics than in the United States, and that students from these countries perform significantly better than students in the United States. They conclude that U.S. standards are not likely to create a framework that develops a deeper understanding of the structure of the discipline. By international standards, the U.S. science framework is „unfocused, repetitive, and undemanding‟”. The study went on to say that “the baseline model reveals a direct and compelling outcome: teaching for depth is associated with improvements in later performance”.

4. Competitive Equity

Every debater should have an equal chance of success no matter their background. Equity means that accommodations should be made with debaters of different abilities. Spreading is inherently an act of exclusion for debaters like me. All voices should be valued and given space for expression in debate. A diversity of voices brings better education to the round and makes the debate community better.

5. Depth over Breadth

Prefer depth of argumentation ove breadth. The best education comes from closely studying a subject and its possible ramifications.

D. Voters

1. Fairness

a. Existence of debate- debaters expect a fair chance of winning when they decide to participate in the debate activity. Debaters with different abilities enjoy this same expectation. If debaters do not have a fair chance of winning and are intentionally excluded from the debate space and community they will no longer choose to compete. Without fair rounds debate as we know it would cease to exist.

b. Fairness is at its core a recognition of personhood and the value of all voices in debate

**Topical fairness requirements are key to effective dialogue—monopolizing strategy and prep makes the discussion one-sided and subverts any meaningful neg role**

**Galloway 7** – professor of communications at Samford University (Ryan, “Dinner And Conversation At The Argumentative Table: Reconceptualizing Debate As An Argumentative Dialogue”, Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, Vol. 28 (2007), ebsco)

Debate as a dialogue sets an argumentative table, where all parties receive a relatively fair opportunity to voice their position. Anything that fails to allow participants to have their position articulated denies one side of the argumentative table a fair hearing. The affirmative side is set by the topic and fairness requirements. While affirmative teams have recently resisted affirming the topic, in fact, the topic selection process is rigorous, taking the relative ground of each topic as its central point of departure.¶ Setting the affirmative reciprocally sets the negative. The negative crafts approaches to the topic consistent with affirmative demands. The negative crafts disadvantages, counter-plans, and critical arguments premised on the arguments that the topic allows for the affirmative team. According to fairness norms, each side sits at a relatively balanced argumentative table.¶ When one side takes more than its share, competitive equity suffers. However, it also undermines the respect due to the other involved in the dialogue. When one side excludes the other, it **fundamentally denies the personhood of the other participant** (Ehninger, 1970, p. 110). A pedagogy of debate as dialogue takes this respect as a fundamental component. A desire to be fair is a **fundamental condition of a dialogue** that takes the form of a demand for equality of voice. **Far from** being **a banal request for links** to a disadvantage, fairness **is a demand for respect**, a demand to be heard, a demand that a voice backed by literally months upon **months of preparation**, research, and critical thinking **not be silenced**.¶ Affirmative cases that suspend basic fairness norms **operate to exclude** particular negative strategies. Unprepared, one side comes to the argumentative table unable to meaningfully participate in a dialogue. They are unable to “understand what ‘went on…’” and are left to the whims of time and power (Farrell, 1985, p. 114). Hugh Duncan furthers this line of reasoning:¶ Opponents not only tolerate but honor and respect each other because in doing so they enhance their own chances of thinking better and reaching sound decisions. Opposition is necessary because it sharpens thought in action. We assume that argument, discussion, and talk, among free an informed people who subordinate decisions of any kind, because it is only through such discussion that we reach agreement which binds us to a common cause…If we are to be equal…relationships among equals must find expression in many formal and informal institutions (Duncan, 1993, p. 196-197).¶ **Debate compensates for the exigencies of the world by offering a framework that maintains equality for the sake of the conversation** (Farrell, 1985, p. 114).¶ For example, an affirmative case on the 2007-2008 college topic might defend neither state nor international action in the Middle East, and yet claim to be germane to the topic in some way. The case essentially denies the arguments that state action is oppressive or that actions in the international arena are philosophically or pragmatically suspect. Instead of allowing for the dialogue to be modified by the interchange of the affirmative case and the negative response, the affirmative subverts any meaningful role to the negative team, preventing them from offering effective “counter-word” and undermining the value of a meaningful exchange of speech acts. Germaneness and other substitutes for topical action do not accrue the dialogical benefits of topical advocacy.

#### **Limits are a pre-requisite – limits control the direction of education**

Matthew Taylor (California State University, Long Beach) and Joseph Anderson (California State University, Long Beach) Summer 2003 “From Jurisdiction to Narration: Standards for Topicality in Parliamentary Debate” http://www.parlidebate.org/pdf/vol9no3.pdf

A second assumption to significance is simply that there are *some things worthy of discussion, and some are not*. Typically, *in all forms of debate* an (if not *the*) *observed standard determining worth of subject mat-ter is education* (Freeley, p. 38). In fact, in just about every topicality vio-lation, the Negative or Opposition team argues that topicality itself is wor-thy of discussion to ensure that the round is educational. In debate how-ever, education carries a unique definition. That is, outside of debate, something is educational if it is simply informative. A nature special on the Discovery Channel is educational if you learn something you did not previously know. However, a debate is educational not through its informative element, but rather through its clash. The notion is that the critic, audience and competitors will be better educated about the issue at hand through a clash of ideas and arguments. The fact that the debate will be informative is taken for granted. Clash however is where debate gets its unique identity. After all, informative or expository speeches not to men90 tion extemporaneous, informative and persuasive speeches are all educa-tional on that first level of delivering knowledge to an audience. However, none of the afore mentioned activities offer education via the clash of ideas.

2. Education

a. Existence of debate- Debate is a CO-curricular activity. School administrators and staff would not continue to support debate if there was not an educational benefit. Without its educational component debate as we know it would cease to exist.

b. Existence of democracy- Debate’s education benefits of critical thinking, research skill, and oral communication are key to facing all existential threats to future democracy.

**The impact outweighs—deliberative debate models impart skills vital to respond to existential threats**

Christian O. **Lundberg 10** Professor of Communications @ University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, “Tradition of Debate in North Carolina” in Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century By Allan D. Louden, p311

The second major problem with the critique that identifies a naivety in articulating debate and democracy is that it presumes that the primary pedagogical outcome of debate is speech capacities. But **the democratic capacities built by debate are not limited to speech**—as indicated earlier, **debate builds capacity for critical thinking**, analysis of public claims, **informed decision making, and better public judgment**. **If the picture of modem political life that underwrites this critique of debate is a pessimistic view of increasingly labyrinthine and bureaucratic administrative politics, rapid** scientific and technological **change** outpacing the capacities of the citizenry to comprehend them, **and ever-expanding insular special-interest- and money-driven politics, it is a puzzling solution, at best, to argue that these conditions warrant giving up on debate**. If democracy is open to rearticulation, it is open to rearticulation precisely because **as the challenges of modern political life proliferate, the citizenry's capacities can change, which is one of the primary reasons that theorists of democracy** such as Ocwey in The Public awl Its Problems **place such a high premium on education** (Dewey 1988,63, 154). **Debate** provides an indispensible form of education in the modem articulation of democracy because it **builds precisely the skills that allow the citizenry to research and be informed about policy decisions that impact them**, to son rhroueh and evaluate the evidence for and relative merits of arguments for and against a policy in an increasingly infonnation-rich environment, and to prioritize their time and political energies toward policies that matter the most to them.¶ **The merits of debate as a tool for building democratic capacity-building take on a special significance in the context of information literacy**. John Larkin (2005, HO) argues that one of the primary failings of modern colleges and universities is that they have not changed curriculum to match with the challenges of a new information environment. This is a problem for the course of academic study in our current context, but perhaps more important, argues Larkin, for the future of a citizenry that will need to make evaluative choices against an increasingly complex and multimediatcd information environment (ibid-). Larkin's study tested the benefits of debate participation on information-literacy skills and concluded that in-class debate participants reported significantly higher self-efficacy ratings of their ability to navigate academic search databases and to effectively search and use other Web resources:¶ To analyze the self-report ratings of the instructional and control group students, we first conducted a multivariate analysis of variance on all of the ratings, looking jointly at the effect of instmction/no instruction and debate topic . . . that it did not matter which topic students had been assigned . . . students in the Instnictional [debate) group were significantly more confident in their ability to access information and less likely to feel that they needed help to do so----These findings clearly indicate greater self-efficacy for online searching among students who participated in (debate).... These results constitute strong support for the effectiveness of the project on students' self-efficacy for online searching in the academic databases. There was an unintended effect, however: After doing ... the project, instructional group students also felt more confident than the other students in their ability to get good information from Yahoo and Google. It may be that the library research experience increased self-efficacy for any searching, not just in academic databases. (Larkin 2005, 144)¶ Larkin's study substantiates Thomas Worthcn and Gaylcn Pack's (1992, 3) claim that **debate in the college classroom plays a critical role in fostering the kind of problem-solving skills demanded by the increasingly rich media and information environment of modernity**. Though their essay was written in 1992 on the cusp of the eventual explosion of the Internet as a medium, Worthcn and Pack's framing of the issue was prescient: the primary question facing today's student has changed from how to best research a topic to the crucial question of learning how to best evaluate which arguments to cite and rely upon from an easily accessible and veritable cornucopia of materials.¶ There are, without a doubt, a number of important criticisms of employing debate as a model for democratic deliberation. But cumulatively, **the evidence presented here warrants strong support for expanding debate practice** in the classroom as a technology **for enhancing democratic deliberative capacities**. **The unique combination of critical thinking skills, research and information processing skills, oral communication skills, and capacities for listening and thoughtful, open engagement with hotly contested issues argues for debate as a crucial component of a rich and vital democratic life**. In-class debate practice both aids students in achieving the best goals of college and university education, **and serves as an unmatched practice for creating thoughtful, engaged, open-minded and self-critical students who are open to the possibilities of meaningful political engagement and new articulations of democratic life.**¶ **Expanding this practice is crucial, if only because the more we produce citizens that can actively and effectively engage the political process, the more likely we are to produce revisions of democratic life that are necessary if democracy is not only to survive, but to thrive.** **Democracy faces a myriad of challenges, including**: domestic and international **issues of class, gender, and racial justice**; **wholesale environmental destruction** **and the potential for rapid climate change**; emerging **threats to international stability** in the form of terrorism, intervention and new possibilities for great power conflict; **and increasing challenges of rapid globalization** including an increasingly volatile global economic structure. **More than any specific policy or proposal, an informed and active citizenry that deliberates with greater skill** and sensitivity **provides one of the best hopes for responsive and effective democratic governance, and by extension, one of the last best hopes for dealing with** the **existential challenges** to democracy [in an] increasingly complex world.