SADA
South Australian Debating Association Inc

That we regret the dominance of Disney in popular culture.

1. Type of topic

This is an empirical topic, which means neither team has "fiat", that is, the right to exactly define the policy being debated, and the general assumption that whatever policy they propose is feasible. The best interpretation of these topics is *"That the world would have been better if Disney was not dominant in popular culture"*. **This is unlike a normative topic,** in which both teams can propose a model describing exactly what a world with Disney dominance . Instead, both teams should use a reasoned argument to illustrate what the *most deductively likely outcome* would look like were the policy passed and were it not passed, and then compare the two.

This argument is called a "counterfactual". A counterfactual argument requires reasoning that shows why a particular outcome is likely; for instance, the affirmative team might argue that *given the assumption Disney did not rise to dominance* the underlying issue would still be significant and some other, superior thing would come to be dominant. The negative might rebut that the assumption that a superior thing would come to dominance.

A deep level of engagement with the opposition's arguments, that addresses their reasoning about causation, is particularly important in empirical debates.

2. Questions to Consider

- What is the role of popular culture?
    - o   Is that aim good or important
    - o   Why would we prioritise this aim over others?
- What does the dominance of Disney look like?
- What would the world look like without the dominance of Disney in popular culture?
- What is the role of Disney?
- What kinds of things does Disney promote?
- What kinds of things would the alternative to Disney promote?