Anti-value of Tyranny  
Affirmative Case by Thomas Sargent

 *“’Didn’t see that coming!”*

If you’ve ever watched the classic TV series *Perry Mason,* chances are, you have caught yourself saying this phrase out loud. For those of you who have yet to enjoy it, I’ll paint you a picture of the basics. Perry Masonis a seemingly unbeatable defense attorney with an incredible mind for detail and logic. What makes the show so brilliant is Perry’s astounding ability to catch the culprit whom you least suspect. Usually the antagonist is the sweet lady that you thought would never be capable of a crime or the disabled brother to the victim who greedily wanted the insurance money. Regardless of who it happens to be, you never see it coming. *What might at first seem like an innocent person ends up as someone guilty of intolerable evil.* The same goes for this year’s LD topic.

You should never ignore a possible threat. This case ensures that you don’t.

If you are a newer LDer, you can break open a hypothetical bottle of sparkling cider and celebrate, because you are about to learn some new value theory. In this affirmative case, I run something called an “anti-value.” For those of you familiar with values, you can guess what this term means. A value is something you want to achieve or treasure. An anti-value is something you want to stay away from, or exterminate. It’s as if you were saying, “Vote for me, and you can get rid of this bad thing!” Today, I give you the anti-value of *tyranny*.[[1]](#footnote-1) I defend it with two anti-value links that fit with the resolution.

As far as the applications go, I give you two interesting examples: The Battle of Trenton and the Normandy Invasions. Both can jump-start your own research of the resolution, but you can certainly use them as a solid starting point. When you run The Battle of Trenton, remind the judge of the impact. Our nation was losing the Revolutionary War, and if we did not use this preemption, we very well could have stayed subject to Great Britain. Another cool thing about this application is that there were very few lives lost. It was still warfare, but it was more peaceful. The *Normandy Invasion* is a whole different story, but it still has significant impact. Taking back the beaches turned the tables on Germany’s power, and helped the U.S. and its allies defeat the Germans. Do not forget to remind the judge of that impact.

Before you begin, remember this: make your case a priority. Your case should be *the most prominent issue in the round.* All your arguments should in some way, reference your case. You can take time to make your case perfect. Spend time on it, and make it yours.

*P.S. For those of you who wonder what the picture above means, let me elucidate. Chocolate is something adored by many. But even chocolate can hurt an individual, by over-consumption, high blood sugar, and…well…let’s face it – diabetes. Something that looks innocent can end up causing damage. The same goes for tyrannical leaders. They often promise help and strength, but they give the exact opposite (cough…Hitler…cough). In this case, you’re going to show the judge that they don’t have to vote for death by chocolate.*

Anti-value of Tyranny

“Justice, sir, is the great interest of man on earth. It is the ligament which holds civilized beings and civilized nations together. Wherever her temple stands, and so long as it is duly honored, there is a foundation for general security, general happiness, and the improvement and progress of our race.”[[2]](#footnote-2)

Daniel Webster, a passionate American representative, once declared this truth as a powerful reminder of an unobstructed moral law that governs our earth: the law of justice. Regardless of the fickle, personal standards of human beings, this justice stands on solid ground as a moral destination that we must strive for.

In this day and age, justice is rejected by corrupt world leaders who often threaten our security, liberty, and well-being with terrifying nuclear developments, harsh zeal for control and destruction, and the will to stop at nothing to tear our society apart. But in the midst of this crisis, the American people like you and I can hold fast to the ability to do what is right by opposing such evil threats.

How do we do that? By enforcing preemptive warfare. Because preemption is an effective strategy to countering corruption, it is morally justified.

Let’s briefly set up the battlegrounds for our debate with some definitions.

# Definitions

**Preemptive Warfare** happens “when a state [or nation] that is about to be attacked decides to strike first at its enemy and thus disrupt the impending attack.”[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Moral** means “concerning or relating to what is right and wrong in human behavior.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

**Justify** is to “Show or prove to be right or reasonable.” [[5]](#footnote-5)

Now that we have established to grounds for our debate, let us get started with the main points of my case.

I am going to do something a little different today. In most rounds, debaters run values. They suggest that if you vote for them, you get to achieve or treasure something good. However, today I will run what is called an *anti-value,* which is something that you can stay away from or destroy if you vote affirmative. The anti-value that we must get rid of is:

# Anti-Value: Tyranny

Oxford Dictionaries defines tyranny as “Cruel, unreasonable, or arbitrary use of power or control.”[[6]](#footnote-6) In the world, this means that countries should be free to live from their independence, free from oppressive control of other nations. Why should we value the removal of tyranny as a top priority?

## Value Link One: Proves Common Moral Ground

One of the tricky burdens that both sides of the resolution carry is the concept of morality. Although I have my own views on what is moral, not everyone agrees with those standards. If you ask people about worldviews, you will get a dramatically different answer each time. But most people agree that it is morally undesirable to be subject to oppressive leaders. The resolution becomes much more reasonable when you realize that the removal of tyranny is commonly accepted as a good move.

## Value Link 2: Impact Calculus

As fiery patriot Patrick Henry famously declared,

“I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!”[[7]](#footnote-7)

Patrick Henry understood that tyranny or oppression in any form cannot be tolerated by men who care about freedom. The rule of tyrannical leaders has given way to a mass violation of precious values such as liberty, unity, equality, human dignity, security, and the pursuit of happiness. Every human right we have must be protected by the rightful opposition to tyranny.

So, it is obvious we need to combat tyranny. How do we do that? We use preemptive warfare.

# Contention 1: Preemptive Warfare Combats Tyranny

Throughout America’s history, we have had to use preemptive warfare in desperate battles against corrupt leaders. It is through preemption we conquered. Let us look at a few examples.

## Application 1: The Battle of Trenton

Before the revolutionary war, the soon-to-be-American people were oppressed by a greedy tyrannical king named George III. Much conflict arose because the American colonies were weary of the king’s unfair and burdensome laws and restrictions. As any nation would, the 13 colonies fought to become an independent country, ruled by the people, not by a tyrant.

Naturally, war broke out between the two opposing nations, starting in the two cities of Concord and Lexington. Unfortunately, for much time, the power lay in Britain’s favor. Although we had a strong rebellion at first, George III eventually held much more of the upper hand over our people, and general George Washington realized the gravity of the situation. If we were to lose the war, we would be completely subject to a loathsome king who oppressed our freedom, life, and happiness. So, it was obvious we needed to have victory over England. The problem was that Washington’s options were running low. Losing troops, ammunition, and motivation, George Washington knew that he had to do something before we lost completely.

That was when he enforced a brilliant idea: preemptive warfare. Washington discovered the location of a company of Hessians – German people hired by Britain. On Christmas Eve, Washington and histroops sailed a dangerous, cold, and miserable voyage across the Delaware and preemptively snuck an attack against the opposing Hessians.

The surprise was very effective. Most of the opposing men were captured by George Washington’s troops, and only a few were shot. This attack tightened the colonies’ grip on the war, and it helped give Washington’s men strength to continue fighting. Eventually, the colonies fought harder and harder until we won the revolutionary war and became a free, independent nation, under God, securing the protection of justice and human rights. Our liberty as a nation may not have happened if preemptive warfare was not enforced.[[8]](#footnote-8)

## Application 2: The Invasion of Normandy

Fast forward to 1944 during the second World War. Germany had taken control of France and was seeking to capture all of Europe. If it somehow managed its goal, it would have the chance to easily win the war. However, with Great Britain and America as allies against the German forces, Dwight D. Eisenhower enforced an idea that could turn the conflict in our favor. He set up a joining of the USA, United Kingdom, Poland, Canada, Australia, and some other countries to strike preemptively on the Normandy beaches where German forces had taken control. After this surprise turn of events, the US and its allies fought hard and eventually regained the beaches and pushed Germany out of France.[[9]](#footnote-9)

# Conclusion

Had we not given a chance to preemption, we might have still been under the oppression of George III. Had we not used preemptive warfare, we very well could have let the German troops win WWII. It was through preemptive strikes that America could counter the damage done by tyrannical leaders, restoring freedom, independence, and human rights.

As Thomas Paine once put it, “Those who want to reap the benefits of this great nation must bear the fatigue of supporting it.”[[10]](#footnote-10) With this philosophy in mind, I urge you to stand for a nation that protects its rights. A nation devoid of tyranny. A nation that fights tyranny with preemptive warfare.

Thank you.

Opposing This Case

Resist the urge to run Hitler as a super vitamin and just say, “Hitler used preemption! Coincidence? I THINK NOT!” Think a little more strategically.

Let’s look at the anti-value. The interesting thing about this case is that it will surprise many LDers. Some people have not debated anti-values, and they don’t know exactly what to run against one. Honestly, as a negative, I would probably just accept the anti-value and prove why it doesn’t link to the affirmative. The reason being that there isn’t a good reason *not* to battle tyranny, and even if we can never completely get rid of it, it is still worth fighting against. Nevertheless, there are some convincing arguments you can run against the affirmative.

* **Preemption often backfires.** Consider the attack on Pearl Harbor. The Japanese fighters killed many of our men because they believed we were a threat to their chances of winning the war. However, the US entered WWII *because* of this attack, and eventually we bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki with atomic bombs. The impact? Preemptive warfare was used to keep America out of the war, but ended up drawing our nation into the conflict.
* **Tyrannical leaders use preemptive warfare.** Ever considered that throughout history, many evil leaders have struck first? If you have not, let me show you how they have. Osama bin Laden forced al-Qaeda to destroy precious lives during the 9/11 attacks. Why? He considered us a threat to Islam. Obviously, Japan struck first using preemptive warfare during the attacks on Pearl Harbor. And let us not forget the German blitzkriegs into Poland and France as well as Operation Barbarossa.

If you would rather debate value clash, try considering this argumentation:

* **Value Link One: Tyranny is subjective.** Ask people if tyranny is bad, and you’ll hear yes. Ask people what they consider tyranny to be, and you’ll be sucked into an ocean of different responses. Our time is the most opinionated in history. It has gone so far that some people think that the stopping of abortion is tyrannical. Even though most people agree that we should get rid of tyranny, they disagree with what it looks like in the real world.
* **Value Link Two:** **So what?** Of course tyranny is bad. And obviously, it would hurt us. But that does not prove that it should be the top priority. Sure, we should remove tyranny. However, that is not a reason to prefer the Aff’s anti-value over your value. Just the fact that it deeply changes our society does not prove it is the most critical issue.

Now that you have taken down the affirmative anti-value structure, here is what you can run against the applications:

* **The Battle of Trenton did not overthrow tyranny.** In the time of the revolutionary war, the colonists were fighting a tyrannical leader. But even though we eventually pulled away from his rule, King George was still on the throne. We didn’t overthrow tyranny here, even though we weren’t subject to it anymore.
* **In the Normandy Landings, preemption failed.** Ironically in the Normandy Invasion, preemption didn’t work very well. Yes, we eventually captured the beaches, but our first day fighting with preemption was not very fruitful. We lost many men. Sure, we ultimately won the Normandy Invasion, but it wasn’t because of preemptive warfare.

In closing, remember to place the focus on your case. You should address your opponent’s applications quickly, and end your speech with whatever inspiration you can conjure up. The judge must believe that your case is the most prominent issue.

Good luck, and may God bless your competition!
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