#### 2. Precision—our Court of Appeals ev is fantastic on the need to preserve a distinct meaning for restrictions—the aff blends various related terms which undermines lexical coherence and creates loopholes for bad faith actors. Precise definitions are key to shared understanding and topic education, which outweighs all their offense

**Pregerson, 6** – US Judge for the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Harry, ARMANDO NAVARRO-LOPEZ, Petitioner, v. ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General, Respondent. No. 04-70345 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT 503 F.3d 1063; 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 22312, 11/19, lexis)

Expanding these categories beyond recognition at the expense of depriving common words like "felony" and "violence" of their ordinary meaning does a disservice to the law. In order for judges to apply laws and for citizens to obey them, words must have meanings that are consistent and predictable. Precision in language is necessary not only for effective communication, but also for a well-functioning legal system. As guardians of the rule of law, we should be careful not to contribute to the deterioration of the English language, with the loss of respect for the law that inevitably results.

### vagueness bad

#### Vagueness means the aff is manipulated to fail

**Thompson 2k** (Anne, FAO, Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches at the Policy Level

Paper prepared for FAO e-conference, March, <http://www.livelihoods.org/pip/pip/tho2-fao.doc>) (emphasis in original)

Policy itself can be analysed conceptually at a number of different levels. In its broadest sense, the term policy can be used to include projects, programmes, strategies, plans and their implementation, in fact every element of public or collective decision-making. Although it is a rather artificial simplification, policy can be divided into content and the process of policy formulation, in other words the way in which that content is arrived at. The way in which policy is implemented can change the effective content of policy, either because policy interactions have not been fully understood, or because the policy is subverted by those responsible for implementing it.

### limits good

**Limits are where it’s at:**

**1. Participation**

**Rowland 84** (Robert C., Baylor U., “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective. Ed. Parson, p. 53-4)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing in scope and size.4 This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience “negophobia,”7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 The final effect may be that **entire programs** either **cease functioning** or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

**2. Innovation, limits outweigh marginal cost of discarding affs that “think outside the box”**

Intrator, 10 [David President of The Creative Organization, October 21, “Thinking Inside the Box,” http://www.trainingmag.com/article/thinking-inside-box

One of the most pernicious myths about creativity, one that seriously inhibits creative thinking and innovation, is the belief that one needs to “think outside the box.” As someone who has worked for decades as a professional creative, nothing could be further from the truth. This a is view shared by the vast majority of creatives, expressed famously by the modernist designer Charles Eames when he wrote, “Design depends largely upon constraints.” The myth of thinking outside the box stems from a fundamental misconception of what creativity is, and what it’s not. In the popular imagination, creativity is something weird and wacky. The creative process is magical, or divinely inspired. But, in fact, creativity is not about divine inspiration or magic. It’s about problem-solving, and by definition a problem is a constraint, a limit, a box. One of the best illustrations of this is the work of photographers. They create by excluding the great mass what’s before them, choosing a small frame in which to work. Within that tiny frame, literally a box, they uncover relationships and establish priorities. What makes creative problem-solving uniquely challenging is that you, as the creator, are the one defining the problem. You’re the one choosing the frame. And you alone determine what’s an effective solution. This can be quite demanding, both intellectually and emotionally. Intellectually, you are required to establish limits, set priorities, and cull patterns and relationships from a great deal of material, much of it fragmentary. More often than not, this is the material you generated during brainstorming sessions. At the end of these sessions, you’re usually left with a big mess of ideas, half-ideas, vague notions, and the like. Now, chances are you’ve had a great time making your mess. You might have gone off-site, enjoyed a “brainstorming camp,” played a number of warm-up games. You feel artistic and empowered. But to be truly creative, you have to clean up your mess, organizing those fragments into something real, something useful, something that actually works. That’s the hard part. It takes a lot of energy, time, and willpower to make sense of the mess you’ve just generated. It also can be emotionally difficult. You’ll need to throw out many ideas you originally thought were great, ideas you’ve become attached to, because they simply don’t fit into the rules you’re creating as you build your box.

**Also correlates with productivity**

Slee, 10 [Mark Slee, May 24, 2010, “Are limitless resources or a certain number of constraints more beneficial for creativity?,” online: http://www.quora.com/Art-Creativity/Are-limitless-resources-or-a-certain-number-of-constraints-more-beneficial-for-creativity]

Both anecdotally and from personal experience, I'm inclined to say that constraints are a strong enabler of creative output, and a requirement for most. The degree certainly varies by individual and depends upon the method. With that said, I think the most commonly applied creative approach essentially involves two steps: \* Define a set of parameters to work within (you'll often hear artists/musicians speaking similarly about "setting up a creative space") \* Explore the space as freely and fully as possible (the bulk of creative time tends to be spent in this phase) The obvious pitfalls here are creating either too large or too narrow a space to work in. Intuitively, it may seem that a larger space is better due to the freedom it affords, but I tend to think the opposite is actually the case. Having too many variables or resources to work with can be very paralyzing, especially for highly creative types. Highly creative people may easily overwhelm themselves with an incredible number of exciting new ideas, which can make it very difficult to actually execute on anything (I don't have personal experience with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, but I imagine there's a reasonably strong analogy to be made here). Generating creative output (not just a deluge of ideas) requires finding a way to artificially suppress the firehose of competing new concepts, thereby enabling a more intense focus.

### precision good

#### Precision outweighs

Gene Whitney (Section Research Manager at the Congressional Research Service), Carl E. Behrens (Specialist in Energy Policy at the CRS) and Carol Glover (Information Research Specialist at the CRS) November 2010 “U.S. Fossil Fuel Resources:

Terminology, Reporting, and Summary” http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.view&FileStore\_id=04212e22-c1b3-41f2-b0ba-0da5eaead952

Terminology A search for energy statistics in the literature quickly reveals a large number of terms used to describe amounts of fossil fuels. Most of these terms have precise and legitimate definitions, and even a careful comparison of statistics for diverse forms of fossil fuels can become quite difficult to reconcile or understand. Not only do oil, natural gas, and coal occur in many diverse geologic environments, but each commodity may occur in different modes or in different geologic settings that impose vastly different economics on their recovery and delivery to market. A vocabulary of terms has developed over the decades to capture the nature of deposits in terms of their likelihood of being developed and their stage of development.

**Precision is vital—turns solvency and research quality**

**Resnick 1** [Evan Resnick, Journal of International Affairs, 0022197X, Spring 2001, Vol. 54, Issue 2, “Defining Engagement”]

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a **precondition** for **effective policymaking**. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.