

private sectors, yet women have equal rights in the workforce. Although women are not equally represented in the workforce or in government, the male-dominated government enacted Convention 100 in 2001, ensuring equal remuneration for men and women for work of equal value. Furthermore, the government formulated its first National Policy for Development and Empowerment of Women in 2002, calling for reform in areas such as domestic violence, health, and justice.¹³ Many other countries that have patriarchal government systems have enacted or at least discussed similar legislation. Even where women have little involvement, their issues are still being addressed.

While preparing its strategies for debate, the negative should use alternative methods of reasoning to check on the affirmative's case and to construct its case. First, it should find examples of the cause absent and the effect present. In this way, it can use the method of difference to point out the drawback of the method of agreement.

The method of correlation can be a very effective method in constructing the negative's case. Although finding examples of societies where the separation of public and private spheres is entirely absent may be difficult, many societies have higher or lower degrees of separation. The negative then may examine societies with a larger degree of separation (the cause) and see whether these societies actually have a higher degree of violations (the effect). Alternatively, the decrease in the cause should lead to the decrease of the effect. Studying such examples may demonstrate alternative significant causes for the effect on which the negative may choose to build its case.

The negative should **keep in mind logical fallacies accompanying cause-and-effect reasoning** when preparing its case. The fallacy of hasty generalization frequently characterizes cause-and-effect reasoning based on the method of agreement. Hasty generalization occurs when a debater, after analyzing a few cases where the cause and the effect coexist, concludes that all or most cases with the same cause will lead to the same effect. For instance, based on the existence of public-private separation in different areas of life in Uzbekistan and the degree of violation of women's rights, the affirmative concludes that all countries with public-private separation will have violations. Clearly, one or two examples are insufficient to prove a causal relationship. The question is how many examples must the affirmative supply to prove that a certain cause leads to a particular effect. The negative team cannot and should not demand that the affirmative account for all countries in the world. The team does have a right, however, to expect the affirmative to demonstrate that in the majority of cases (or countries), the separation of public and private sectors leads to the violation of women's rights. One way to avoid the hasty generalization is to examine countries that differ in terms of religion, economic situation, or political order. If countries differ in all those aspects but have two similarities, the existence of the cause and the effect, the generalization may, in fact, be valid. When analyzing the affirmative case, then, the negative should watch for hasty generalizations.