

## Topicality

Topicality is how much an argument maintains applicability to the resolution as it is worded.

Topicality is an argument made often by the negative. It is considered a 'no-loss' argument for the negative to run, as it shouldn't take a lot of time to present the argument, but should cost the AFF a great deal of time to respond to it. Also, if the negative loses the topicality argument, it doesn't affect the ballot. But, if the negative wins the topicality argument, the ballot goes NEG. The affirmative has to do work to argue that the plan is topical, but even if the AFF wins the topicality argument, in order to win the round, the AFF must win other arguments as well.

Often topicality on the negative

How to run a topicality argument (done by Neg only):

While on the negative, the debater chooses which part of plan does not fully meet the resolution. This can be a particular word, or the case in its entirety. Often the topicality argument run by the negative is on the word 'substantially.' This word is often in resolutions, such as "The United States Federal Government should *substantially* increase..." Neg can argue that the plan presented does not *substantially* increase, but only slight increases. This can be done a few ways.

Standards for Topicality:

Standard	Uses by Neg (making the argument)	Uses by Aff (defending the argument)
Counter-Definition	<p>Neg will argue that the AFF plan does not fulfill the definition of one of the words in the resolution. This can be as vague as 'substantial' or as concrete as 'The United States Federal Government.' If the AFF plan uses a different actor, or only makes a small change, NEG can argue that AFF does not meet the topicality standard.</p> <div> <p>To run topicality, the NEG will read a definition in the round of one of the words in the resolution, and then explain why the AFF plan does not meet that definition.</p> </div>	<p>AFF will argue that the plan is in fact meeting the definitions set by AFF.</p> <div> <p>To defend Topicality here, the AFF will read the definition that the AFF plan meets. Then, AFF will argue why their definition is preferable.</p> </div>
Counter-Interpretation	<p>Neg will argue that something presented by AFF does not meet the 'true interpretation' of the resolution.</p>	<p>AFF will defend the AFF stance by saying that the interpretation of the resolutions meets the letter of the law,</p>

	<p>EXAMPLE: a resolution that will 'guarantee the right to housing' doesn't say to whom. So, while the standard interpretation might be to American citizens AFF is not required to run that. If AFF runs that housing should be guaranteed to citizens under the age of 18, NEG can run a topicality argument in which they run a counter-interpretation that AFF is required to encompass all citizens and restricting it to minors is not topical.</p> <div> <p>To run a counter interpretation NEG must present the offending aspect and then define what would be topical under neg's interpretation.</p> </div>	<p>and that the interpretation is not only acceptable, it gives NEG plenty of ground to argue on.</p> <div> <p>To defend topicality here the AFF will read the resolution and then argue why the interpretation presented in the AFF case fits the letter of the law and argue that there is plenty of ground for NEG to be able to argue.</p> </div>
Extra-topicality	<p>This is usually run in tandem with effects. This basically says that parts of the AFF plan (usually the parts that yield the best impacts) are extra topical, or not covered by the resolution.</p> <p>The test is: could this mandate occur without the resolution being affirmed? If the answer is 'yes,' then it is extra topical.</p> <p>For example, if the res states that Car purchases in the U.S. should be only vehicles manufactured in the U.S. An extra topical effect would be a campaign to encourage engineering students in the United States. Mandating the campaign would be Extra topical.</p>	<p>AFF needs to remember that Extra Topicality is NOT apriori, like other topicality arguments. This is important, and should be the first thing said when defending an extra topicality attack.</p> <p>If neg wins an extra-topicality argument, that means the impact/disadvantage is tossed, not the entire case.</p>
Effects Topicality (FX)	<p>This is run on the effects of the plan. This is run specifically on the benefits claimed by AFF.</p>	<p>In this argument, Neg would try to pull one of the benefits that Aff is claiming. This can be devastating to an Aff case that has only one benefit, or only one that isn't easily arguable.</p>

<p>Effects Topicality (FX) continued</p>	<p>Both Extra and FX topicality can be conceded without conceding the entire round. If it would mean wasting a lot of time arguing against this, but your opponent had a lot of holes that mean you can win the round, sometimes it's best to let these go. However, if you have the time, argue it.</p> <p>Cases with strong LINKS can always combat both Extra and FX topicality.</p>	<p>An example would be in a res stating seashells are the dominion of the sea, and shouldn't be collected by humans in Aff argues that people would begin stimulating the arts economy to replace these shells, that could FX topical.</p>
------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------