

The meaning of the resolution was disputed in this debate. The disputed term is "non-sense". Pro contends that the meaning is "doesn't make sense" or "ridiculous", or something like that. Con's provided definition is from a dictionary. This creates, effectively, two competing resolutions. Ultimately though, under either resolution, Con's arguments prevail. So, it isn't necessary for me to decide which competing interpretation of the resolution is correct, but I will discuss that anyway.

#### Resolution 1: "non-sense" using Pro's definition

Pro provided no evidence that anything in the debate made homosexuality "non-sense". Con more accurately summed up the situation as "it merely neglected to explain why homosexuality makes sense." (perhaps more accurately stated would be "it neglected to discuss homosexuality") Which, from the gist of things, is really what I'm gleaning was going on with the documentary, at least based on Pro's statements. (e.g. "By the end of the documentary, you'll ask yourself a question. Something to the effect of " Well where does this leave homosexual attraction?"" - A viewer puzzled by homosexuality after watching the documentary suggests that the topic was passed over; "the science of sex appeal deals with explaining sexual attraction via biological, anatomical, physiological, hormonal analysis to the point where it leaves no room to ascertain how homosexuality fits amidst the various analytical data." - This further makes it seem like there was simply no discussion of homosexuality in the documentary.

Ultimately I'm inclined to go with Con here, though it was close. Pro provided no evidence. Pro even admits there is no evidence. Pro states that the documentary thoroughly explained the heterosexual phenomenon and left him wondering how the homosexual phenomenon could possibly be explained. An explanation for a phenomenon is not evidence that a different phenomenon can't have an explanation or "doesn't make sense". This isn't convincing in the slightest.

Con doesn't present any evidence, either. Though, really, it's not like Con can prove a negative. Pro admits that the documentary doesn't discuss homosexuality. So, there's really no purpose in Con watching the documentary or linking it. I would have liked to Con discuss this "Resolution 1" more thoroughly than he did rather than focus on the competing definition. Though, given Pro's lack of evidence, this is something that seems like a default victory scenario based on burdens.

#### Resolution 2: "non-sense" using Con's definition

Con's case using this resolution is clearly in his favor. Using Con's definition, the claim that "homosexuality is non-sense" is saying something like "homosexuality is unintelligible". The falseness of such a claim isn't disputed by Pro, who insists on using his definition. It appeared that both debaters agreed that using Con's definition the resolution was false. So, not much RFD needed here.

Re: Correct interpretation of the resolution

I view resolution interpretation as something that is not part of the debate and not subject to the ordinary rules of debate judging. In other words, I'm not confined to the arguments and reasoning of the debaters for or against particular interpretations.

I refer to CACI 314 and 315 (google-able)

#### 314. Interpretation—Disputed Words

[Name of plaintiff] and [name of defendant] dispute the meaning of the following words in their contract: [insert disputed language].

[Name of plaintiff] claims that the words mean [insert plaintiff's interpretation]. [Name of defendant] claims that the words mean [insert defendant's interpretation]. [Name of plaintiff] must prove that [his/her/its] interpretation is correct.

In deciding what the words of a contract mean, you must decide what the parties intended at the time the contract was created. You may consider the usual and ordinary meaning of the language used in the contract as well as the circumstances surrounding the making of the contract

#### 315. Interpretation—Meaning of Ordinary Words

You should assume that the parties intended the words in their contract to have their usual and ordinary meaning unless you decide that the parties intended the words to have a special meaning.

The usual and ordinary meaning is in Con's favor. So, unless there is evidence that a special meaning was intended, Con's definition prevails.

There is evidence that a special meaning was intended. In the debate description, immediately following the resolution is the resolution paraphrased as follows:

This documentary, "The science of sex appeal", which I highly recommend you watch in order to really debate this topic makes sense of heterosexuality. So much so in contrast, homosexuality doesn't make sense at all .

The phrase "doesn't make sense at all" aligns closely with the resolution's use of the term "non-sense". Further evidence that such an interpretation was intended by Pro is that Con's definition was so heavily in his favor that it would be somewhat strange for Pro to have used it. Additionally, there is no mention of homosexuality being "unintelligible" or something like that in the debate description, while there is further implication of Pro's usage -

By the end of the documentary, you'll ask yourself a question. Something to the effect of " Well where does this leave homosexual attraction?"

Basically all of the studies in the documentary were pointing to one thing. That is baby making.

The foregoing evidence of an intended special meaning was clear to me when I read the debate description for the first time. This special meaning was reasonably discernable from the debate description and Con was therefore on fair notice as to Pro's intentions. Accepting this debate in good faith would require using the objectively implicated special meaning. Ergo, Pro's definition prevails despite the fact that it is not consistent with the usual and ordinary meaning of the word.