

2015

Affirmative

Affirmative 1

 Resolution.....2

 Possible Plans.....3

 Advantages4

Negative 5

 Topicality 6

 Impact Arguments 7

 Disadvantages 8

 Circumvention DA.....9

 Terrorism DA10

 Politics DA (Iran Nuclear Deal)11

 Presidential Powers DA12

 Counterplans 13

 Congress CP14

 Supreme Court CP15

 State Courts CP16

 Ex Post Review CP17

 Kritiks & Theory 18

Other Bylaws 19

 From 2015-2016 UHSSA Handbook20

 Committee Made Rules21

2015

Resolution

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially curtail its domestic surveillance.

2015

Possible Plans

The United States federal government should...

- (1) prohibit the use of unpiloted aerial vehicles for domestic surveillance without a warrant
- (2) implement the Secure Data Act.
- (3) substantially curtail its surveillance of information in the custody of American corporations by exclusively limiting surveillance to investigations carried out under section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act.
- (4) rule that its domestic surveillance on the basis of race, religion and ethnicity is unconstitutional.

* Affirmative teams must include one of these EXACT plan texts.

2015

Advantages

ANY advantages that stem from one of the four plans are allowed as long as they are in an original aff file. Possible advantages might include: Privacy, Economic growth, US technological competitiveness, Cyber security, Human intelligence, Racism, and Internet Freedom

2015

<h1>Negative</h1>

Negative	5
Topicality	6
Impact Arguments	7
Disadvantages	8
Circumvention DA.....	9
Terrorism DA	10
Politics DA (Iran Nuclear Deal)	11
Presidential Powers DA	12
Counterplans.....	13
Congress CP	14
Supreme Court CP	15
State Courts CP	16
Ex Post Review CP	17
Kritiks & Theory	18

2015

Topicality

Judges, coaches, and debaters should also understand that by selecting these specific case limits, the UDCA/NFHS is not endorsing the topicality of all cases within these limits. Traditional topicality arguments can still be presented by the negative team and should be.

2015

Impact Arguments

Economic Growth (Good and Bad)

US Hegemony (Good and Bad)

Democracy Promotion (Good and Bad)

Ethical Impact Framing (Utilitarianism and Deontology)

Disadvantages

Circumvention DA

Terrorism DA

2015

Politics DA (Iran Nuclear Deal)

Presidential Powers DA

Counterplans

UDCA

Novice Argument List

2015

Congress CP

UDCA

Novice Argument List

2015

Supreme Court CP

UDCA

Novice Argument List

2015

State Courts CP

Ex Post Review CP

2015

Kritiks & Theory

Kritiks & Theory are NOT allowed in the novice division. This also prohibits a team from reading “critical” link arguments on case as a hidden disadvantage.

2015

Other Bylaws

Other Bylaws19
 From 2015-2016 UHSSA Handbook20
 Committee Made Rules21

2015

From 2015-2016 UHSSA Handbook**2015-16 UHSAA HANDBOOK SPEECH/DEBATE****Article III - Conduct of Tournaments; Section 4: Novice Policy Guidelines**

Novice teams will only be allowed to run arguments from the approved argument list and corresponding evidence set. Novice policy teams will be limited to a “closed deck” of evidence files (every competitor will have the same set of cards). Novice students may rearrange the organization of evidence but may not add and/or change the content in order to produce new arguments not labeled in the evidence set, nor can they alter the fundamental intent of the argument.

These limits will be enforced from the start of the season until the end of December. Novices will be allowed to run any argument or evidence in January until the end of the season. Any novice team found to be running an affirmative not on the case list will forfeit the round. “Novice teams” will be defined in the tournament invitation.

The novice evidence set is established each year by the UDCA and NHFS to limit the areas of the high school debate resolution that novices will have to prepare to debate. The goal is to make the debating more manageable for novice students and to enhance the quality of each debate. Judges, coaches, and debaters should also understand that by selecting these specific argument limits, the UDCA/NFHS is not necessarily endorsing the topicality any case, nor are they commenting on the strategic value of any one position. Traditional topicality arguments can still be presented by the negative team and should be considered by the judge. Theory and kritik arguments will not be allowed.

An executive committee of coaches will create the evidence set to be published on the Utah Debate Coaches website by the end of August.

2015

Committee Made Rules

1. If any major argument becomes non-unique the UDCA Executive Committee will release a new argument to take its place.
2. No theory arguments or specification arguments. Extra topicality and effects topicality arguments will be considered theory and will not be allowed in the novice division.
3. The director of each tournament has the final say if an affirmative fits within the four allowed options.
4. Working definition of “theory” arguments:
 - a. An argument that is considered an “independent voting issue.”
 - b. A “procedural” objection to an “arguably unfair” practice.
 - c. An argument about the “form” of debate, instead of the “content.”
5. Affirmative teams can test the competitiveness and desirability of the counterplan with a permutation. The only perm allowed on is “Permutation: Do Both.”