## Judge Choice – 2AC

### Outcome vs. Justification

### Reps are justifications for the plan, not outcomes. Many possible justifications exist. If our *justification* is bad, pick another and do the plan because its *outcome* is desirable.

### Reasons to prefer:

### 1. 1AC reps were potential, not mandatory. No link to “severance” because there was never attachment in the first place. Their burden to prove otherwise.

### 2. Logic: it’s critical to effective decision-making. Otherwise, good ideas will be rejected because they have sub-optimal advocates. Key portable skill.

### 3. Turns their impact. They privilege *form* over *content*. It’s a conservative tactic to focus on *how* one argues instead of *what* is being argued. Shuts down progressivism.

### 4. Critical thinking: assess arguments according a strict standard of relevance to the plan --- anything else teaches a model of decision-making that amplifies all global problems

Bassham 7 (Gregory, Professor, Chair of the Philosophy Department, and Director of the Center for Ethics and Public Life – King’s College, et al., Critical Thinking: A Student’s Introduction, p. 3-10)

Relevance

Anyone who has ever sat through a boring school assembly or watched a mud-slinging political debate can appreciate the importance of staying focused on relevant ideas and information. A favorite debaters’ trick is to try to distract an audience’s attention by raising an irrelevant issue. Even Abraham Lincoln wasn’t above such tricks, as the following story told by his law partner illustrates: In a case where Judge [Stephen T.] Logan—always earnest and grave—opposed him, Lincoln created no little merriment by his reference to Logan’s style of dress. He carried the surprise in store for the latter, till he reached his turn before the jury. Addressing them, he said: “Gentlemen, you must be careful and not permit yourselves to be overcome by the eloquence of counsel for the defense. Judge Logan, I know, is an effective lawyer. I have met him too often to doubt that; but shrewd and careful though he be, still he is sometimes wrong. Since this trial has begun I have discovered that, with all his caution and fastidiousness, he hasn’t knowledge enough to put his shirt on right.” Logan turned red as crimson, but sure enough, Lincoln was correct, for the former had donned a new shirt, and by mistake had drawn it over his head with the pleated bosom behind. The general laugh which followed destroyed the effect of Logan’s eloquence over the jury—the very point at which Lincoln aimed. 4 Lincoln’s ploy was entertaining and succeeded in distracting the attention of the jury. Had the jurors been thinking critically, however, they would have realized that carelessness about one’s attire has no logical relevance to the strength of one’s arguments.

 Consistency

It is easy to see why consistency is essential to critical thinking. Logic tells us that if a person holds inconsistent beliefs, at least one of those beliefs must be false. Critical thinkers prize truth and so are constantly on the lookout for inconsistencies, both in their own thinking and in the arguments and assertions of others. There are two kinds of inconsistency that we should avoid. One is logical inconsistency, which involves saying or believing inconsistent things (i.e., things that cannot both or all be true) about a particular matter. The other is practical inconsistency, which involves saying one thing and doing another. Sometimes people are fully aware that their words conﬂ ict with their deeds. The politician who cynically breaks her campaign promises once she takes ofﬁ ce, the TV evangelist caught in an extramarital affair, the drug counselor arrested for peddling drugs—such people are hypocrites pure and simple. From a critical thinking point of view, such examples are not especially interesting. As a rule, they involve failures of character to a greater degree than they do failures of critical reasoning. More interesting from a critical thinking standpoint are cases in which people are not fully aware that their words conﬂ ict with their deeds. Such cases highlight an important lesson of critical thinking: that human beings often display a remarkable capacity for self-deception. Author Harold Kushner cites an all-too-typical example: Ask the average person which is more important to him, making money or being devoted to his family, and virtually everyone will answer family without hesitation. But watch how the average person actually lives out his life. See where he really invests his time and energy, and he will give away the fact that he really does not live by what he says he believes. He has let himself be persuaded that if he leaves for work earlier in the morning and comes home more tired at night, he is proving how devoted he is to his family by expending himself to provide them with all the things they have seen advertised. 6 Critical thinking helps us become aware of such unconscious practical inconsistencies, allowing us to deal with them on a conscious and rational basis. It is also common, of course, for people to unknowingly hold inconsistent beliefs about a particular subject. In fact, as Socrates pointed out long ago, such unconscious logical inconsistency is far more common than most people suspect. As we shall see, for example, many today claim that “morality is relative,” while holding a variety of views that imply that it is not relative. Critical thinking helps us recognize such logical inconsistencies or, still better, avoid them altogether.

 Logical Correctness

To think logically is to reason correctly—that is, to draw well-founded conclusions from the beliefs we hold. To think critically we need accurate and well supported beliefs. But, just as important, we need to be able to reason from those beliefs to conclusions that logically follow from them. Unfortunately, illogical thinking is all too common in human affairs. Bertrand Russell, in his classic essay “An Outline of Intellectual Rubbish,” provides an amusing example:

I am sometimes shocked by the blasphemies of those who think themselves pious—for instance, the nuns who never take a bath without wearing a bathrobe all the time. When asked why, since no man can see them, they reply: “Oh, but you forget the good God.” Apparently they conceive of the deity as a Peeping Tom, whose omnipotence enables Him to see through bathroom walls, but who is foiled by bathrobes. This view strikes me as curious. 8

 As Russell observes, from the proposition

 1. God sees everything. the pious nuns correctly drew the conclusion

 2. God sees through bathroom walls.

 However, they failed to draw the equally obvious conclusion that

 3. God sees through bathrobes.

 Such illogic is, indeed, curious—but not, alas, uncommon.

 Completeness

In most contexts, we rightly prefer deep and complete thinking to shallow and superﬁcial thinking. Thus, we justly condemn slipshod criminal investigations, hasty jury deliberations, superﬁcial news stories, sketchy driving directions, and snap medical diagnoses. Of course, there are times when it is impossible or inappropriate to discuss an issue in depth; no one would expect, for example, a thorough and wide-ranging discussion of the ethics of human genetic research in a short newspaper editorial. Generally speaking, however, thinking is better when it is deep rather than shallow, thorough rather than superﬁcial.

 Fairness

Finally, critical thinking demands that our thinking be fair—that is, openminded, impartial, and free of distorting biases and preconceptions. That can be very difﬁ cult to achieve. Even the most superﬁ cial acquaintance with history and the social sciences tells us that people are often strongly disposed to resist unfamiliar ideas, to prejudge issues, to stereotype outsiders, and to identify truth with their own self-interest or the interests of their nation or group. It is probably unrealistic to suppose that our thinking could ever be completely free of biases and preconceptions; to some extent we all perceive reality in ways that are powerfully shaped by our individual life experiences and cultural backgrounds. But as difﬁ cult as it may be to achieve, basic fair-mindedness is clearly an essential attribute of a critical thinker.

 THE BENEFITS OF CRITICAL THINKING

Having looked at some of the key intellectual standards governing critical reasoning (clarity, precision, and so forth), let’s now consider more speciﬁcally what you can expect to gain from a course in critical thinking.

 Critical Thinking in the Classroom

When they ﬁrst enter college, students are sometimes surprised to discover that their professors seem less interested in how they got their beliefs than they are in whether those beliefs can withstand critical scrutiny. In college the focus is on higher-order thinking: the active, intelligent evaluation of ideas and information. For this reason critical thinking plays a vital role throughout the college curriculum.

In a critical thinking course, students learn a variety of skills that can greatly improve their classroom performance. These skills include

• understanding the arguments and beliefs of others

• critically evaluating those arguments and beliefs

• developing and defending one’s own well-supported arguments and beliefs

 Let’s look brieﬂy at each of these three skills.

To succeed in college, you must, of course, be able to understand the material you are studying. A course in critical thinking cannot make inherently difﬁcult material easy to grasp, but critical thinking does teach a variety of skills that, with practice, can signiﬁcantly improve your ability to understand the arguments and issues discussed in your college textbooks and classes.

In addition, critical thinking can help you critically evaluate what you are learning in class. During your college career, your instructors will often ask you to discuss “critically” some argument or idea introduced in class. Critical thinking teaches a wide range of strategies and skills that can greatly improve your ability to engage in such critical evaluations.

You will also be asked to develop your own arguments on particular topics or issues. In an American Government class, for example, you might be asked to write a paper addressing the issue of whether Congress has gone too far in restricting presidential war powers. To write such a paper successfully, you must do more than simply ﬁnd and assess relevant arguments and information. You must also be able to marshal arguments and evidence in a way that convincingly supports your view. The systematic training provided in a course in critical thinking can greatly improve that skill as well.

 Critical Thinking in the Workplace

Surveys indicate that fewer than half of today’s college graduates can expect to be working in their major ﬁ eld of study within ﬁ ve years of graduation. This statistic speaks volumes about changing workplace realities. Increasingly, employers are looking not for employees with highly specialized career skills, since such skills can usually best be learned on the job, but for employees with good thinking and communication skills—quick learners who can solve problems, think creatively, gather and analyze information, draw appropriate conclusions from data, and communicate their ideas clearly and effectively. These are exactly the kinds of generalized thinking and problem-solving skills that a course in critical thinking aims to improve.

 Critical Thinking in Life

Critical thinking is valuable in many contexts outside the classroom and the workplace. Let’s look brieﬂ y at three ways in which this is the case. First, critical thinking can help us avoid making foolish personal decisions. All of us have at one time or another made decisions about consumer purchases, relationships, personal behavior, and the like that we later realized were seriously misguided or irrational. Critical thinking can help us avoid such mistakes by teaching us to think about important life decisions more carefully, clearly, and logically. Second, critical thinking plays a vital role in promoting democratic processes. Despite what cynics might say, in a democracy it really is “we the people” who have the ultimate say over who governs and for what purposes. It is vital, therefore, that citizens’ decisions be as informed and as deliberate as possible. Many of today’s most serious societal problems—environmental destruction, nuclear proliferation, religious and ethnic intolerance, decaying inner cities, failing schools, spiraling health-care costs, to mention just a few—have largely been caused by poor critical thinking. And as Albert Einstein once remarked, “The signiﬁcant problems we face cannot be solved at the level of thinking we were at when we created them.”

## Judge Choice – 1AR

### Judge Choice defeats the K

### Reps are potential justifications, not outcomes. If a justification is bad, pick another and do the plan because the outcome is desirable. Voting Aff doesn’t require agreeing with *all* of the 1AC.

[explain how judge choice applies to the situation at hand]

### Not severance: there never was initial attachment. Reps are always optional. This is a false import from CP competition with no logical basis. It’s their burden to prove otherwise.

### Theoretical defense of the importance of Reps doesn’t cut it. Reps *may* shape reality, but *only if* their used when making policy. Their ev agrees.

### Offensive reasons to prefer:

### 1. Key to logic: otherwise, good ideas get rejected because they have sub-optimal advocates. Logic outweighs: portable decision-making skills are the terminal impact to debate.

### 2. Turns the K: privileging *form* over *content* is a conservative tactic that crushes progressivism.

### 3. Strict logical relevance’s key to critical thinking --- shapes decision-making to solve all global problems --- that’s Bassham

### We solve their offense:

### 1. Reps Ks still have value. They can independently beat the Aff by negating all justifications, or be combined with a DA to take out most of the case and outweigh. It’s no different than other arguments that aren’t stand-alone voting issues.

### 2. “Reps good” arguments are consistent. They matter, it’s only a question of which you choose.

## Judge Choice – 1AR – A2: Kills Neg Ground

### It improves it. Reps Ks have strategic utility to nullify huge parts of the Aff, but it forces them to be part of a larger strategic package that disproves the plan.

### Logic is prior. Arguments matter insofar as they actually negate. This is like saying “Significance is a Voter – or it kills ground”.

### Other arguments solve: they can critique the plan or structural method of the entire case.

## Judge Choice – 1AR – A2: “We Straight-Turned”

### No. They critiqued a potential justification, not a mandatory outcome. You can agree with the plan and the K and vote Aff. They’re not incompatible.

### They misunderstand “offense”. Yes, Reps Ks are “offensive” reasons not to make certain descriptions, but the logical conclusion is not to justify that way in the first place. It’s only offense against the plan if you choose it, but thesis of our argument is that you don’t have to.

## Judge Choice – 1AR – A2: Plan Focus Bad

### It’s not plan focus. Reps have a place in our framework. Chosen justifications shape policy. It’s just a question of what justifications you choose.

### But, there is such thing as advocacy. The plan is different than “Observation One: Inherency”.

### One is a statement.

### The other is a normative recommendation.

### We’re the best middle ground, they go too far:

### 1. Aff ground --- they COMPLETELY change the focus of the debate to pure performance --- moots the 1AC and any predictable meaning of “USFG should” --- ground outweighs: it’s key to engage their argument

### 2. Worse education --- the point of methods is to eventually improve policy --- that’s Anti-Politics