

**T: Adopt means the policy must already exist.....2**  
**T: Adopt means the policy must be new .....3**

**T: Adopt means the policy must already exist**

**A: INTERPRETATION**

The word "Adopt" implies that the policy being adopted must already exist on some level.

**OJIELO** – legal scholar – **2003**

[M. Ozonnia – LL.B Hons. (Law) – 9 Ann. Surv. Int'l & Comp. L. 135 – *Human Rights and Sharia'h Justice in Nigeria*]

The word "adopt" is defined in the New Oxford Dictionary of English as "to take up or start to use or follow something, especially an idea, method or course of action."

**B: VIOLATION**

The plan establishes a policy, but does not adopt one – the plan is a completely new policy that has never taken place in any form.

**C: STANDARDS**

(1) **Limits** – Allowing the affirmative to create new policies out of the blue unlimits the topic to an unpredictable degree – the negative can never be prepared to anticipate every possible policy that could be created

(2) **Education** – New policies allow the affirmative to run squirrely affirmatives that have very little literature written about them – this encourages shallow, underdeveloped debate.

(3) **Ground** – Our interpretation ensures that there will be a well-defined literature base that exists for every topical affirmative – this means that both sides will have sufficient, equal amounts of ground to choose from.

**D: TOPICALITY IS A VOTING ISSUE**

Voting against non-topical affirmatives is necessary to ensure and preserve competitive equity by discouraging unfair strategies. Proving that you are a legitimate part of the topic is an a priori burden of every affirmative.

**T: Adopt means the policy must be new**

**A: INTERPRETATION**

To “adopt” a policy that policy must be new.

**DICTIONARY.COM** – accessed 7/30/06

[Adopt:]

- a. To take and follow (a course of action, for example) by choice or assent: *adopt a new technique.*
- b. To take up and make one’s own: *adopt a new idea.*

**B: VIOLATION**

The plan merely makes firm or alters an existing policy.

**C: STANDARDS**

- (1) **Limits** – there are an infinite amount of minor modifications to existing policy that the affirmative could take on – this is an unpredictable research burden for the negative.
- (2) **Ground** – without our interpretation, the affirmative can always get around their burden of inherency by making small changes to things that already exist. This makes all negative argumentation non-unique.

**D: TOPICALITY IS A VOTING ISSUE**

Voting against non-topical affirmatives is necessary to ensure and preserve competitive equity by discouraging unfair strategies. Proving that you are a legitimate part of the topic is an a priori burden of every affirmative.