Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic and/or diplomatic engagement with the People’s Republic of China.
Dear 2016 Participant,

Welcome and thank you for joining us at the 2016 Debate Day. It is with great joy we bring you another day of community building and learning.

We continue to be so impressed by the desire for advanced learning and scholarship. As debaters, you demonstrate your commitment to critical thinking and understanding everyday and we honored to both facilitate your learning and learn by your side.

We would like to extend a special thank you to Michigan State University for their ongoing support of Michigan high school policy debate through initiatives such as Debate Day. We thank the Honors College at MSU for valuing policy debate and the outreach provided by Carly Watson and their fantastic debaters.

We are also grateful to Dr. Danielle Leek of Grand Valley State University for her dedication to the activity. Her commitment to academic debate as pedagogy and political communication aids the development of debate in the classroom and beyond. We are so excited for your next adventures.

We extend our continued gratitude to our schools who continue to lead and teach in policy debate. Mona Shores, and Seaholm High School continue to demonstrate their dedication to our community. You have empowered thousands of students to live their best academic lives. Thank you, Mr. Peter Shaheen and Mr. Adam Colburn. Thank you for putting community first and aiding in the development of accessible debate. We are also grateful to Wayland Union High School for hosting again this year. Thank you to Ms. Andrea Brown for hosting and sharing your beautiful facilities with us.

And thank you to all the students in attendance. Thank you for believing and valuing yourselves enough to try this intense activity. Your coaches believe in you. Place your trust in the journey and debate can bring you opportunities you never dreamed possible. We are excited to learn together—now and forever. Hope today is the launching pad to a great debate career.

Sincerely,
Ellen Zwarensteyn
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**DEBATE GOALS**

1. How might debate be valuable to me? Why?
2. How might debate add value to my life and my education?
3. In what ways will I positively contribute to the group discussion and to my learning?
4. What do I need to do to meet my goals?
5. How will I know if I am achieving my goals? How will I know if I’ve learned it?

My Goals:

---

- Improve Critical Thinking &
- Understand Current Events
- Develop Public Speaking & Confidence!
- Practice Inquiry and Research Strategies
- Understand Philosophy

My Goals:

---

- Harness the Power of Language
- Understand and Use Debate Theory
- Develop Friendships and Community
- Understand and Participate in Politics
- Understand Identity and Social Location

All While Having Fun and Traveling
WHY POLICY DEBATE?
Besides how fun it is...

IT EMPHASIZES FLUID INTELLIGENCE. Rather than simply accumulate facts along the way, figure out how to move your brain around all sorts of complex information. This will help push you up the knowledge (Bloom’s) taxonomy and depths of knowledge (Webb)!

IT HELPS TO REORGANIZE THE BRAIN. Science proves that there is something special about the quickness of the debater’s brain. It physically restructures itself though new synaptic connections to make the debater a more efficient thinker and speaker. Never be caught off your toes again!

IT IS CHALLENGING AND EMPHASIZES CRITICAL THINKING
Challenge yourself to think deeper and analyze real-world complexities! Develop real critical thinking skills.

DEBATE REQUIRES A GROWTH-MINDSET. Debaters constantly examine strengths and weaknesses knowing they can continue to improve on weaknesses. Nothing is too much a challenge with a little reflection and effort. Debate rewards growth!

ACADEMIC BENEFITS OF DEBATE  http://urbandebate.org/urbandebateworks.shtml
From the executive summary:
In a new research study conducted in conjunction with the University of Michigan, the Consortium on Chicago School Research, and Chicago Public Schools, Dr. Briana Mezuk demonstrates that participation in urban debate dramatically raises graduation rates for low performing urban students. The study looked at academic records from a sample of 12,179 Chicago public school students, including 2,449 urban debate participants. Of these students, she further examined outcomes for 2,614 African American male students, of whom 458 competed in urban debate. All statistical findings were examined in light of eighth grade achievement test scores, to adjust for the possibility that debate inherently attracts high-achieving students.

• The overall rate of high school graduation for Chicago students in the research sample is 55 percent.
• Urban debaters in Chicago schools graduated at a rate of 77 percent.
• African-American males in Chicago schools graduate at a rate of about 45 percent.
• African American males who participated in the Chicago Debate League were almost 70 percent more likely to graduate than their non-debater peers.
  • Urban debate students increased their GPA by 0.20 (20 percent of a letter grade).
  • African American male urban debaters increased their GPA by 0.5 (50 percent of a letter grade).
  • Urban debate students were 50 percent more likely to reach the ACT English benchmark than non-debater students.
  • African American male urban debaters were twice as likely to reach the ACT English benchmark as non-debater students.
  • African American males who participated in urban debate were 70 percent more likely to reach the ACT benchmark in Reading than non-debater counterparts.

DEBATE ACHIEVES POLITICAL LEARNING  http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses/35/
This paper advances through research how sustained competitive high school policy debate experience directly advances political learning and should be a tool to engage students politically. Debaters tend to focus on issues rather than partisan politics, consider themselves well informed on issues of national and international importance, incorporate reflexive political identities, feel their daily lives and activities manifest political actions, and have increased comfort levels employing political advocacy skills including the articulation and design of political argumentation. Policy debate encourages high school students to access critical concepts of political engagement.

COMMON CORE CURRICULUM
The language, rigor, and relevance of the emerging Common Core Curriculum coincides with policy debate uniquely. The more students becomes scholars and critics of argument, the more they will meet the demands of the new curriculum. Debaters use Quadrant D leaping on a regular basis and know how to adapt their ideas to a forever changing and unpredictable world!
Structure of a Competitive Debate Round
Speech Order & Times

1A  2A  Judge  1N  2N

**STRUCTURE OF A HIGH SCHOOL POLICY DEBATE ROUND**
1AC  8 Minutes
2N cross-examination of the 1AC  3 Minutes
1NC  8 Minutes
1A cross-examination of the 1NC  3 Minutes
2AC  8 Minutes
1N cross-examination of the 2AC  3 Minutes
2NC  8 Minutes
2A cross-examination of the 2NC  3 Minutes
1NR  5 Minutes
1AR  5 Minutes
2NR  5 Minutes
2AR  5 Minutes
*Shake Hands, Listen and Write for Feedback for Reflection

**Prep Time:** 8 Minutes per side—Varies by competition

**KEY:**
- A = Affirmative
- N = Negative
- C = Constructive
- R = Rebuttal

2NC = 1NR = NEGATIVE BLOCK

**STRUCTURE OF A MODIFIED MIDDLE SCHOOL POLICY DEBATE ROUND**
*and demo debate (modified to include both rebuttal speeches)*
1AC—4 minutes
- Cross-Examination—2 minutes
- Negative Preparation time—2 minutes
1NC—4 minutes
- Cross-Examination—2 minutes
- Affirmative Preparation Tim—2 minutes
2AC—4 minutes
- Cross-Examination—2 minutes
- Negative Preparation Time—2 minutes
2NC—4 minutes
- Cross-Examination—2 minutes
1NR—2 minutes
- Affirmative Preparation Tim—2 minutes
1AR—2 minutes
- Negative Prep Time—2 minutes
2NR—2 minutes
- Affirmative Preparation Tim—2 minutes
2AR—2 minutes
*Shake Hands, Listen and Write for Feedback for Reflection
## Duties of each speech in the debate round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1AC</th>
<th>1NC</th>
<th>2AC</th>
<th>2NC/1NR</th>
<th>1AR</th>
<th>2NR</th>
<th>2AR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Story time!** | | | | | | **What a fun speech to do!**
| **Present 1AC** | | | | | | **You get to show off your plan and your story is the most important issue facing the world.**
| 1AC may be in a variety of formats—Contention, Observation, or Advantage Case | | | | | | **Start with an overview.**
| An affirmative need to present elements of all these arguments but may not necessarily label each component. | | | | | | **Answer each negative argument.**
| This may be done in either a stock issues or comparative advantage framework | | | | | | **Use the line-by-line to keep your study and convince us that we must try to do your affirmative.**
| 1AC must meet its prima facie burdens—have Inherency, Harms (also called impacts, advantages), Plan, and Solvency (Structure up to debaters) | | | | | | **Remember to prove you won your stock issues or prove a comparative advantage over the status quo (or if there are other advocacies—tell us why your plan is better than those).**

### 1AC

- Present the structure of all off case and major on case arguments.
- Think of the 1NC as the outline that the negative will develop in detail in the negative block.
- 1NC should include the following arguments chosen by the team.
- Off-case arguments include: Topicality, Disadvantages, Counterplans, Critiques, Kritiks.
- On case arguments: Case Debate Please place the case debate on the appropriate flow to match the affirmative position.

### 1NC

- Present the structure of all off case and major on case arguments.
- Think of the 1NC as the outline that the negative will develop in detail in the negative block.
- 1NC should include the following arguments chosen by the team.
- Off-case arguments include: Topicality, Disadvantages, Counterplans, Critiques, Kritiks.
- On case arguments: Case Debate Please place the case debate on the appropriate flow to match the affirmative position.

### 2AC

- 2AC needs to answer all the off case and on case arguments presented by the 1NC in addition the 2A should explain more of their 1AC.
- Any Topicality arguments should be answered first (unless strategically placing later for clarity).
- Each off case arguments should be answered by starting with #1 then continuing the numbering (#2, #3 etc.) until the debater has finished with all their arguments on that off case argument. The 2A should continue start numbering with #1 with each off case position.
- When answering the negative’s on case arguments, the 2A should reference the 1NC argument (by name and/or number) and answer. It is appreciated when the 2A answers these case arguments in an organized fashion.
- Grouping or cross-answering is encouraged when relevant.

### 2NC/1NR

- **The Negative Block**
- One of the most exciting times in a round is when the negative gets to put 13 minutes of argumentative pressure on the 5 min. 1AR!
- To do this effectively, the negative MUST "divide the block." This is an important concept to avoid redundancy and develop the outline established in the 1NC into full detail.
- The 2N and the 1N should decide who is going to take and develop each issue. This is best done by each speaker taking a separate piece of paper with its own issue on it. For example, the 2N may take 2 disads and solvency and the 1N may take topicality and harms.
- Off case arguments should be answered by 1) extending the original story or thesis of the argument with any relevant overview and 2) answer the line-by-line by using the 2A2 numbering. Thus the negative should say (after the overview) "off the 2AC 1 - the __argument" then proceed to make arguments systematically down the flow. It is helpful to start with the 2AC #1 then work down to the end.
- When developing the negative’s on own case arguments, the block should continue to reference the 1NC argument (by name and/or number) and answer it. This is the time for the negative to go more into depth on the argument. While brand new arguments are frowned upon, new, deeper analysis on existing arguments causes us to smile. It is appreciated when these case arguments are made in an organized fashion.
- Grouping or cross-answering is encouraged when relevant.
- The negative should appropriately kick arguments they decide not to go for.

### 1AR

- **No pressure 1A! Your goal is to set up a great 2AR.**
- Here you have 5 minutes to answer the 13 minute of the block. Relax — you can do it. Here’s how:
  - *You need to answer every piece of paper that the negative went for in the block (and select offense on others if they didn’t kick their arguments correctly)* You do not need to answer every number on each sheet of paper, but you do need to extend key arguments from each paper that your partner will need for the 2AR.
  - Any Topicality arguments should be answered first. Off case arguments should continue to be answered by extending the original story or thesis of the argument with any relevant overview and 2) answer the line-by-line by using the 2A2 numbering. Thus the negative should say (after the overview) “off the 2AC 1 - the __argument” then proceed to make arguments systematically down the flow. It is helpful to start with the 2AC #1 then work down to the end.
- When developing the negative’s on own case arguments, the block should continue to reference the 1NC argument (by name and/or number) and answer it. This is the time for the negative to go more into depth on the argument. While brand new arguments are frowned upon, new, deeper analysis on existing arguments causes us to smile. It is appreciated when these case arguments are made in an organized fashion.
- Grouping or cross-answering is encouraged when relevant.
- The negative should appropriately kick arguments they decide not to go for.

### 2NR

- **Decisions, decisions, decisions!**
- An introductory overview is very important. It will help tell the judge how to vote. It also shows the judge you know what is going on and you understand why you should win.
- Make choices! A good 2NR will develop fewer arguments and spend more time explaining and comparing them to the aff’s arguments.
- The negative should appropriately kick arguments they decide not to go for. Then, develop key arguments the neg needs to win. After the overview, still use the line-by-line and embed your story there.
- Typically, topicality is considered an all or nothing strategy if gone for in the 2NR. Most would recommend spending all 5 minutes on T if that is the strategy of choice.
- For the substantive debate, negative should consider options that compete with or exceed the intensity of the 1AC. Tell the judge how to vote (kindly but persuasively).
I. SPEAKING AND LISTENING.
PLUS THE ART OF COLLABORATION.
STOP, COLLABORATE, and LISTEN

Need to listen to respond.

I. STOP
Pause, relax - brain needs time to process.
Pause, process, and paraphrase

II. COLLABORATE
Collaboration Skills
7 Norms of Collaboration (Thinking Collaborative)

Focus: Practice Paraphrasing..
In Class:
So you are saying...
So you believe...
So you are working through...
So you really value...
So you really want to say mindful of..
So a goal for you is...

In Cross-Examination:
So your argument is...
So the implication to your argument is...
So you are saying...
So your evidence posits...
So this impact means you really value...

Always be transparent and organize students. Great for practice and clas.
When in class or small group meetings, are you in dialogue or discussion?
Dialogue (understanding and awareness) v Discussion (decision making)
*Organize the practices. 1s and 2s... 1s raise hand...

III. LISTEN
Listen to the best of the argument and with the best of intentions.
Practice ethical listening.

LET’S PRACTICE!
I. THE RESOLUTION
Why a resolution? How do we choose a resolution as a whole country?

Examples of past resolutions include…

II. 2016-2017 Resolution.
Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic and/or diplomatic engagement with the People’s Republic of China.

III. What might we want to know about the resolution before debating?

How might these become research questions? Formulate a few research questions here:

IV. Brainstorm/Structured Ideation:
What might the resolution include?
Please write those ideas in the circle.

What might the resolution exclude?
Please write those ideas outside the circle.

How could you tell what should or should not fall inside and outside of the circle?
## Topic Breakdown
Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic and/or diplomatic engagement with the People’s Republic of China.

### Break it down:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words:</th>
<th>What it might mean?</th>
<th>What it might exclude?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USfg:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially/Increase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Engagement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic Engagement:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What sources might you want to site for different definitions?
Topic Breakdown

Resolution / Topic Notes:
“While there is a wide range of views in both the United States and China on how to manage bilateral relations, few dispute the assertion of leaders on both sides that the U.S.-China relationship is the most consequential bilateral relationship of our time, as China’s spectacular economic growth, its military modernization, and its increasingly active role on the regional and global stages have focused attention on the prospects for cooperation or conflict between the United States and China in the coming decades.” - James Steinberg and Michael O’Hanlon

Briefest of Histories (consider perspective)

U.S.

China
China Topic Lecture: https://spartandebateinstitute.wikispaces.com/2016+Lectures
Maggie Berthiaume

Brief Conceptual History
Pre 1776
1776

Civil War
1830s

Immigration
And Exclusion Acts
1937-1945
1945
1949

World War II
1958-1961

Internment

Cold War and ‘Opening’
Domino Theory

Nixon

Taiwan

Trade and Communism

End of the Cold War? Communism
End of the Cold War—Communism?

Present
Political Climate
HRC v DT

Present
Political Climate
Xi (she) Present
**Topic Breakdown**

**Resolution / Topic Notes:**

**Size and Scope**

How Big?
- $\frac{1}{5}$ of the world’s population
- 1 billion more than US 1.3 billion
- 5 cities > NY
- 14 cities > LA
- By 2025 $\frac{1}{4}$ of the world’s largest cities will be in China

![Map of China](https://smith2china.wordpress.com/2011/03/21/maps-of-china/)

**Sample of Key Terms/Places:**

- Domino Theory
- Socialism
- Communism
- Free Market
- Mixed Economy
- PRC
- ROC
- One China
- Security Umbrella
- South China Sea
- Spratly Islands
- Free Trade
- Conditional Trade—Most Favored Nation Status, Jackson-Vanik
- UN
- Russia
- Uighurs
- Colonialism/Neo-Colonialism
- No First Use
- Mutually Assured Destruction
- Seventh Fleet (Japan, South Korea)
**Topic Breakdown**

**Resolution / Topic Notes:**

**Government Structure**

![Chinese Government Org Chart](chart.png)

**Life in China**
- Religion
- Political Freedoms

**What the US gets right? What the US gets wrong?**

**Shifts in governmental regimes?**

**Major Issues Now**

**Security, Economy, and Rights**
- Engagement (Appeasement) vs. Containment
- Quid pro quo
- Conditional vs. Unconditional Consultation

**Security Issues with US**
- South China Sea
  - Spratlys and Scarborough Shoal
  - Paracel Islands
- East China Sea
  - Senkaku (Japanese name)
  - Diaoyu (Chinese Name)
- North Korea/Japan
  - Taiwan
  - 1 China?
  - Calculated Ambiguity
- Cyber Security
- Climate Change
- Terror

**Economic Issues with US**
- IPR Intellectual Property Rights
- Equal Access to markets
- Bilateral Investment Treaties
- Currency Manipulation

**Rights**
- Xinjiang - Uighers (Muslim)
- Tibet (Dali Llama)
- Hong Kong - defense and political nominations
- Taiwan - 1 China Policy?

**Additional Considerations:**
- Resource in Africa
- Warfare in Africa
- Neocolonialism in Africa
- Ocean Exploration
- Space Exploration
  - and/or Militarization
- Race Relations within China
- Race and Beauty Standards
  - (Western Influence?)
- Market Transitions
  - And So More
Topic Breakdown
Resolution / Topic Notes: Geography

Consider the geography of the area in increasing complexity. Be able to point out critical areas to locate and understand the important issues.

Ex. 1

Ex. 2

Ex. 3
Add Seas, Navy Ships, Military Bases, etc.
III. Parts of an Argument
Toulmin’s Argument Model
Getting as close to truth as you can

PARTS OF AN ARGUMENT:            EXAMPLE:
Claim       Provides topic focus / main idea
Might include action or direction –
    you “should”… this “will”… this “won’t”
Statement you want someone to believe is true
Surface level statement or belief

Warrant     Answers Why?
Connect the why between claim and data
Connect to ethos, logos, and pathos
Inductive Reasoning “bottom-up” reasoning
    Specific examples form broad generalizations
Deductive Reasoning “top-down” reasoning
    Take broad example and apply it to a specific situation

Data / Ground Data
Hard Facts
Statistics
Truth upon which the claim is made
Important to question objectivity
Inductive Reasoning “bottom-up” reasoning
Deductive Reasoning “top-down” reasoning

Other considerations of the Toulmin Model:

Backing     Provide other information
Additional support – not key to initial claim
Consistent with claim

Qualifier          Strength of Claim
Question how universal the claim is
Suggest conditions under which claim is true
Keywords such as “all, most, many, few, never, probably, etc.”

Reservation
Allow for incorrect or other interpretations
Except for this ___, this statement is true
In my experience, this is true

Counter-argument
Presenting information opposite or to the contrary of what was said
Preempt opposing argument
In debate, we can present counter-arguments and answer them
## IV. Rhetoric / Communication

Aristotle’s Model of Proof

**The Rhetorical Triangle**

### Element of Persuasion: Define: Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of Persuasion</th>
<th>Define</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Alternative View of Debate
The Triangle Intention of Policy Debate
Phenomenological Research
Productive Debates

**Phenomenological Research:**
Study of human experience and being
All research is inevitably, inherently subjective

**Performance and Identity Debates**
VI. Speaking and Articulation Activities

Like all activities, the more we practice, the better we get. The focus is always on clarity! Always clarity! It just so happens we get more efficient with practice!

Why? Research suggests the more we practice reading the more:
- Eye-Brain coordination we develop
- New synaptic connections are created
- New words become easier
- Our confidence increases
- Our reading scores (across the content areas) increase
- We like learning more
- We don’t act out of fear (less acting out)
- Bonding

When? How?
- Practice a little bit all the time
- Practice with whatever material you have
- Practice reading in all your classes
- Always practice out loud
- Always practice fairly loud
- Breathe from diaphragm (check with hand on stomach vs shoulders. Shoulder breathing is shallow and increases stress. Diaphragm/stomach is deeper and relieves stress).

Examples of speaking activities....(all out loud - facing walls etc.)
- Read normally
- Backwards (“Bottom Up”)—start from the bottom of the page then read each word going up
- Add words between the written words—ex. “And” or “Watermelon
- Abada, babada, etc.
- Tongue twisters
- Place a pen between your teeth (the long way) and read. Greatly enhances articulation
- Over articulation
- Storytelling (read as if a story to a 5 year old)
- Reread normally again.

Ask for and record: Noticings and Observations?
Honor the process. Analogies to other activities.

What to emphasize:
Prior Questions: Ability. Stand, sit, etc.
Something. Emphasize words. Fluctuation
Breathe at Punctuation
Tags a bit slower
Consonants
Feet?

More:
VII. Research
Fundamentals of Debate Evidence and Research

Once you have found an article you think makes an argument, how do you organize it to make it into “evidence”? This is a high intensity reading practice called briefing or carding. This turns articles into useful arguments that are ready to be used in a debate round.

Parts of a Card, Brief, or Evidence are:
1. Tag: The summary of the argument.

2. Cite: The source of the information.
   Author/Source, Date
   [Full Name: (if/or journal), Qualifications (if):, Article/Chapter Title, Article/Journal/Book Title: Source (url or page number):Your initials]

3. Direct Quote/Text: The quote from the author. Underline key parts you know you want to read out loud in a debate round.
   (See model next page)

Together—Parts 1-3 is the “EVIDENCE” or “CARD”

How to Cut Your Own Cards
Now. Find articles that are interesting.

Go through the article, underline key arguments. Find a beginning to the argument and the end of the argument. Bracket the beginning and the end.

Make sure these are whole paragraphs—keep an entire argument together. Underline what should be read out loud in a debate round. Keep the rest of the text together for context.
### TITLE OF BRIEF (Main Argument on Case)

Summary of Argument (the most important concept from the card to flow—indicate claim and warrant—simple wording)

**Author’s Last Name** Or **Source** if No Author is Available, **Full Date**

[Full Name: Joel Brinkley, Qualifications (if): 
Article/Journal/Book Title: 
Source (url or page number): Your Initials: ]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Argument</th>
<th>Your School</th>
<th>Name of File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUTTING IT TOGETHER: BRIEFING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUTTING IT TOGETHER: BRIEFING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUTTING IT TOGETHER: BRIEFING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUTTING IT TOGETHER: BRIEFING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reminders/Tips/Must Dos:**

- **ASK, ASK, ASK**
- Bracket entire article first—know which way it concludes before cutting the cards. Always conclude with the author. Context matters!
- Only arguments that fit the same title should be combined on a page. All arguments must fit the title if on a single page.
- Margins—1 Inch Each Side
- Black Ink/Type — Pen that Works (or type)
- Underline Title—Include Like Arguments Together
- Copy and paste from computer or tape on both SIDES of the evidence. Be sure to get the corners in the tape
- Always include a full cite
- No abbreviation, no contractions in tag or title
- Make sure tag and title make an argument.
- No highlighting (can make copy difficult to read if photocopied)
- Underline important stuff?
- *Include full paragraphs to get full context of evidence. Lines of evidence must be in order of the author’s intent.
Analysing US-China Relations
http://pakobserver.net/analysing-us-china-relations/
Pakistan Observer
September 6, 2016
Shahid M Amin
In case Donald Trump wins the forthcoming US presidential election, the world must brace itself for new tensions and crises, which could lead to unpredictable consequences and might end in disaster. He is threatening to build a wall between the US and Mexico to prevent illegal immigration from Mexico, and insists that the latter must pay the cost of building it. Mexico has refused to do so. It is an important neighbour and an old friend. Trump’s stance could jeopardise that relationship.

More disturbing is Trump’s tough talking against China, which is far stronger than Mexico. In a policy paper, he laid out a chargesheet against China. He argues that the Bill Clinton administration made a great mistake in 2000 by supporting China’s entry in WTO. Since then, “Americans have witnessed the closure of more than 50,000 factories and the loss of tens of millions of jobs. America fully opened its markets to China, who has not reciprocated. Its Great Wall of protectionism uses unlawful tariff and non-tariff barriers to keep American companies out of China and to tilt playing field in its favour.”

The policy paper accuses China of currency manipulation, cybercrime, forced technology transfer, and violation of intellectual property laws. “This theft costs the US over $300 billion and millions of jobs each year.” Trump has warned China of a “swift, robust and unequivocal response. If China wants to trade with America, it must agree to stop stealing and to play by the rules.” He accuses China of violating WTO rules by giving illegal export subsidies, tax breaks or rebates and cash bonuses to stimulate exports. As President, Trump “will not succumb to the financial blackmail of a Communist dictatorship.” He will bolster US military presence in the South China Sea to discourage Chinese adventurism. A strong military presence will be a clear signal to China and other nations in Asia and around the world that “America is back in the global leadership business.”

The Chinese response to such vituperation has been restrained. Xinhua stated that Trump was playing the China-bashing card in an attempt to rescue his falling poll numbers. His “inflammatory” rhetoric was meant to appeal to blue-collar workers. His remarks were “dangerous and offered nothing of substance to improve bilateral relations.” Trump is not known for moderation or sound judgement and his views could be seen as an aberration. But the fact is that many circles in the US have serious concerns not only about China’s economic policies but also its overall geostategic posture. The alarmist view is that US and China see each other as serious rivals who are heading towards a confrontation in long-term. A more realistic analysis is that there are areas of both convergence and divergence between them: both remain committed to a policy of mutual accommodation.

China’s view is that Sino-American strategic stability should be the “new model of major-country relations” which should avoid confrontation and conflict, respect one another’s political systems and national interests and pursue win-win cooperation. Some American sceptics hold that acceptance of such a model would create an international environment conducive to China’s rise. It would allow China to become the preeminent power in Asia without any great power competition or conflict. These sceptics see the Chinese proposal as a ploy designed to trick the US into acknowledging China’s extensive territorial claims, and undercutting the interests of America’s strategic partners in the Asia-Pacific region.

In international relations, conflict between a rising power and an established power often happens. This has been termed as “Thucydides’ trap”. The ancient Greek historian Thucydides had concluded that the rise of Athens and the fear that this inspired in Sparta had made war inevitable. Interestingly, President Xi Jinping recently said that “we all need to work together to avoid the Thucydides trap—destructive tensions between an emerging power and established powers. Our aim is to foster a new model of major country relations.” This is easier said than done. The last decade has seen the US establish a strategic alliance with India. The underlying motive for this alliance is their common rivalry with China. On the other hand, China has deepened its existing strategic alliance with Pakistan by launching the ambitious China-Pakistan Economic Corridor. Russia has also been drawing closer to China, making for a possible trilateral partnership. India is wooing Vietnam and Myanmar, two neighbours of China. A shifting of alliances seems to be taking place.

One issue which is potentially explosive is the current tension in the South China Sea involving the Spratly Islands. These are 14 islands and over 100 reefs. The archipelago lies off the coasts of the Philippines, Malaysia and south Vietnam. It has no indigenous inhabitants and contains significant oil and gas deposits. Seven of the islands are occupied by the Philippines, six by Vietnam and one by Taiwan. China’s claims to the islands are mainly based on historical records.

China’s position on the Spratly Islands has been hardening over a period of time. Defence Minister Chang told his American counterpart Chuck Hagel in 2014: “The territorial sovereignty issue is a Chinese core interest. On this issue, we will make no compromises, no concessions.” The US position has similarly hardened. It recently launched a new Asia-Pacific Maritime Security Strategy which aims to “safeguard the freedom of the seas, deter conflict and escalation, and promote adherence to international law.” American Defence Secretary Ashton Carter has stated: “Make no mistake, we will fly, sail, and operate wherever international law permits. We will do that at times and places of our choosing.” China has ignored these warnings and increased its activities and military presence in the area.

An international court recently rejected China’s claims over the maritime area around Spratly Islands. But China has refused to accept the verdict. President Obama has now met his Chinese counterpart during a G-20 Summit in Hangzhou. The biggest convergent interest between the two countries remains the economy. The US is China’s largest market. China wants to concentrate on its economic progress and wants to avoid armed conflicts. President Xi recently said that when the two countries work together, it is good for world peace, e.g.1049 the Paris Climate Change Agreement, the Iran nuclear deal and cooperation on North Korea.

— The writer served as Pakistan’s Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, the ex-Soviet Union, France, Nigeria and Libya.
Poll Finds Deep Split on Climate Change. Party Allegiance Is a Big Factor.

Americans are deeply divided on the causes, cures and urgency of climate change, and party identification is one of the strongest predictors of individual views, according to a poll released Tuesday by the Pew Research Center.

Just over a third of Americans say they care a great deal about climate change. Among them, 72 percent are Democrats and 24 percent are Republicans; both numbers include independents who say they generally lean toward one party.

On other questions on climate change, Americans remain starkly divided: Nearly seven of 10 Democrats believe climate change is mainly a result of human activity; fewer than a quarter of Republicans believe that. A similarly worded question that appeared on surveys from 2006 to 2015 found comparable gaps on the perceived causes of climate change.

According to some scientists who study public perceptions of climate change, the United States is unusual in its relatively low level of public interest and engagement. In a poll conducted last year, around the time that world leaders gathered in Paris to negotiate a climate agreement, Pew found that among the 40 countries surveyed, a median of 54 percent of people considered climate change a serious problem. Among Americans, the figure was 45 percent, that poll found.

The new survey did find areas in which Americans agree across party lines. More than 80 percent, including wide majorities of Democrats, Republicans and independents, favor expansion of the solar and wind industries. About two-thirds of Americans say that climate scientists should play a major role in policy decisions related to climate change.

When it comes to solutions, roughly half of all Americans say that restricting power plant emissions, improving vehicle fuel efficiency and adhering to an international agreement to limit carbon emissions could make a big difference. Republicans are generally more skeptical of the power of individual actions to mitigate climate change.

The Pew poll was conducted as part of a study of science and society. Many of the questions focused on public attitudes toward scientists as a group, and climate scientists in particular. Scientists over all — especially those in medicine — are widely trusted by Americans, with more than three-quarters of people saying they trust them a great deal or a fair amount.

However, climate scientists do not command the same level of public faith. Only 22 percent of Republicans said they trusted climate scientists to give “full and accurate” information on the causes of climate change; for Democrats, that number was 54 percent.

More than 90 percent of climate scientists agree that human activity causes climate change, according to several studies published over the last few years. This level of scientific consensus does not appear to have registered with the public. Just under 40 percent of Democrats perceive widespread consensus; among Republicans, it is just 15 percent. More than half of conservative Republicans think that scientists’ findings are influenced most of the time by their own career interests or political leanings.

Though scientific knowledge is roughly the same among people in both parties, the poll found, that knowledge is no indication of whether Republicans think the earth is warming because of human activity. Among Republicans with high science knowledge (determined by the number of correct responses they gave to science-related questions), 23 percent said human activity was causing climate change. Among Democrats, the level of science knowledge was a better indicator of belief in human effect on the climate.

“It could be the case that people’s political orientations are an anchoring point for applying their knowledge — rather than the other way around,” the Pew report said.

Bob Inglis, a former Republican congressman from South Carolina who is working to get members of his party to accept climate change, said the language often used to discuss the issue had, in part, created the gap in the perceptions of liberals and conservatives.

Part of it is that climate change has been framed as a question of belief, he said. He said that climate activists’ insistence on individual sacrifice drives conservatives crazy.

“When you say you’re shivering or sweating in the dark to save the planet, conservatives don’t cotton to it,” Mr. Inglis said.

More effective, he said, would be to argue that addressing climate change would result in “greater independence, more mobility and more freedom.”

The survey was conducted May 10 to June 6 among 1,534 American adults, with online and mail responses as part of the American Trends Panel created by Pew Research.
NOTE: ALL TEAMS GO AFFIRMATIVE AND NEGATIVE AT MOST EVENTS

In order to uphold the resolution, the affirmative offers a story to compel a judge into action. The elements of the story include inherency, harms/advantages, a plan, and solvency. A specific policy action is called a PLAN (also may hear advocacy).

Although it is not an official stock issue, it is an essential part of the affirmative’s burden of proof. Having Inherency, Harms, a Plan, and Solvency in the 1AC is called the affirmative’s PRIMA FACIE Burden. This is the burden to present all the areas necessary to invite the negative into a dialogue over the 1AC.

Some schools also discuss the personal relevance and why they debate. This discusses the topic’s personal connection. Relevance outlines the framework or paradigm in which we think debate should operate and why.

So a 1AC outline may look like… (Organizing language may differ based on preferences—for example contention may be called observation or harms may be organized into advantages).
Contention One:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inherency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Contention Two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Plan

Contention Three:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solvency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Contention Four:

Relevance/Framework (optional)

*Each would be flowed on a separate sheet of paper.

The affirmative must also prove itself to be topical. This is debatable in some circuits if the aff needs to a literal translation of the topic or a general discussion. This is where the students get to debate a few of the rules of the game. The negative will present T, and the 2AC must answer. If the negative continues to go for T, then the aff still must answer as part of its prima facie, stock issue burden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topicality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The Purpose(s) of Being Affirmative:
- Advocate for the resolution… What else?

Benefits/Advantages of Being Affirmative:

Challenges of Being Affirmative:

Success Criteria:
How do you know if successful:
How to win?

Key Vocabulary:
Inherency
Harms
Plan
Solvency

Key Assumptions/Theory:
FIAT:

Formats:
Stock Issues

Comparative Advantage (over the status quo)

Advantages:
Each advantage would include it’s own harm and solvency.
This is framed as an advantage to doing the plan.

Now Let’s Practice.
Affirmatives are often organized in very specific ways. The words contention or observation are often used to group similar stock issues together. Another version is to organize the IAC in advantage format. This would include an observation of inherency followed by advantages. Each advantage would include it’s own harm and solvency. This is framed as an advantage to doing the plan.

Your turn to practice. *Always say the organizing vocabulary out loud!*

### IAC Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI: Inherency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII: Harms (or advantage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIII: Solvency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obs 1: Inherency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Vision and Purpose. The negative needs to prove that the affirmative plan (or the resolution as a whole) is not a good option. This can be done in a variety of ways! Those are:

CASE:
- Case defense and offense. Say the plan cannot solve or makes things worse.
- Disprove case harms or turn them. Say what they think is bad is actually good (or vice versa).
- Prove their inherency is wrong. If their plan exists, then it doesn’t need to be done. (This is typically an all or nothing strategy)
- Flow this directly against harms or solvency—wherever it matches up against.

TOPICALITY:
Prove the plan is outside the resolution. Prove topicality matters.

DISADVANTAGES aka Disads:
Discuss how the disadvantages of the plan outweigh the advantages.

COUNTERPLANS:
Propose a better/different solution to a problem. Prove this is a competitive policy option!

KRITIKS/CRITIQUES:
Question the underlying assumptions or philosophy of the plan or the 1AC language and representations. Propose a better world-view!

A strategic combination of the above! Think through how the different questions may be related and consider an overall strategies with multiple options to defeat the affirmative!

There may be legitimate variations of these structures. Adapt to your situation!
The Purpose(s) of Being Negative

Benefits/Advantages of Being Negative:

Challenges of Being Negative:

Success Criteria:
How do you know if successful:
How to win?

Key Vocabulary:
Turn
Disadvantage
Kritik
Counterplan
Competitiveness
Topicality
Extra Topicality
Effects Topicality

Key Assumptions/Theory:
FIAT:

*Each Negative Issue is flowed on a separate off-case sheet of paper.
Pretend this is case debate. Develop 1NC offense and defense against it. Flow directly in the 1NC column. Practice short hand!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1AC</th>
<th>1NC</th>
<th>2AC</th>
<th>2NC/1NR</th>
<th>1AR</th>
<th>2NR</th>
<th>2AR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2—&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Warming —                  |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| > sea                      |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| level ↑                    |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| X                            |     |     |         |     |     |     |

| Sea lvl ↑ —                |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| ——> resource              |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| war & ext                 |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| X                            |     |     |         |     |     |     |

Separate Page

| S   |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| US-C coop                  |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| ↓ CO2                      |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| X                            |     |     |         |     |     |     |

| US fg $$$ K                |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| US ldr—Ch                 |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| to follow                 |     |     |         |     |     |     |
| X                            |     |     |         |     |     |     |
Purpose(s):

When Presented/How:
- In inc
- Off case

How Might a Disad Help The Neg Win:
- Outweigh Case  (especially with mitigated harms/solvency)
- Happen Sooner/Prevents Case
- Disad Impacts (War) —> Case Harms
  Turn Case
- Decision Calculus

Structure/Vocabulary:
Uniqueness:

Link:

Internal Link:

Impact:
Applying Disadvantage Logic

Turn the story into a disad below (include structure points).

Story. America needs comprehensive immigration reform to solve for the millions without access the US. Immigration reform is very important to securing a healthy U.S. economy to compete in the world and for US security. A good economy will prevent the US from sliding into war. Right now, President Obama has enough support to get his comprehensive immigration bill through the Senate. If, however, something comes along and changes Pres. Obama’s political capital, it would lessen his ability to persuade others to pass immigration and it wouldn’t pass.

Turn the story into a disad below (include structure points).

______ (Label/Title)

A. Uniqueness

B. Link(s)

Internal Links

C. Impact(s)

Story. The plan would spend a lot of money engaging with China. This would frighten Wall Street and other key financial institutions. Right now the economy is okay—but it is fragile. Should the markets and financial institutions become scared, we could see the likes of another recession that led into the Great Depression. This may spur another War.

Turn the story into a disad below (include structure points).
Applying Disadvantage Logic

Turn the story into a disad below (include structure points).

Story. According to the polls, Secretary Clinton is going to win the election in November. If, however, Pres. Obama does the plan, it will be seen as very, very unpopular which will impact Secretary Clinton. She won’t win the election as a result as the plan gives Donald Trump more popularity. This matters because if Trump were to win, then other countries would see this as a weakness and attack the US. War is likely.

Turn the story into a disad below (include structure points).

________________ (Label/Title)

A. Uniqueness

B. Link(s)

Internal Links

C. Impact(s)

Story. The plan calls for increasing relations and diplomacy with China. This might anger Russia who views US-Russian relations as zero-sum (or directly trading off with one another). Right now through, the US and Russia are doing well. If their relations don’t do well, then war is likely and Russia and the US both have nuclear weapons.

Turn the story into a disad below (include structure points).

________________ (Label/Title)

A. Uniqueness

B. Link(s)

Internal Links

C. Impact(s)
Applying Disadvantage Logic ...
Let’s Practice Making Thesis Statements for Overviews and Negative Storytelling.
Listen to the evidence, collaborate, and write an overview/thesis in the box provided to explain the story.

Ex. 1
The U.S. Elections Disadvantage

Ex. 2
U.S.-Russian Relations

Ex. 3

Ex. 4

**AFFIRMATIVE TIPS: ANSWERING DISADS**

The 2AC needs to answer the disadvantages. On disads, the affirmative begins numbering to answer. This numbering (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) will become the basis for signposting the remainder of the debate.

**Types of affirmative answers may include (number each):**
- Not Unique (Might be N/U for many reasons)
- Empirically Denied (History might disprove the story)
- No Brink -
- No Threshold
- No Link(s)
- No Internal Link(s)
- No time frame (s)
- No Impact
- Case May Outweigh or Solve the Impact

Plus the 2AC should consider offense. Either (NEVER NEVER NEVER BOTH):
- Link Turn (No. the plan causes the opposite to occur).
  
**Note:** You will likely need two win a Not Unique paired with a link turn to create offense and to win this argument.

*Or*
- Impact Turn (the impact you say is bad is actually good)

---

**NEGATIVE TIPS: HOW TO KICK DISADS AND MAKE THEM GO AWAY**

**General Motto…. Grant the defense to make the offense go away**

If link turned:

**DO:**
- no impact... no internal link
- compare link v link turn

**DON’T:**
- n/u or no link (usually)

If impact turned:

**DO:**
- No link
- No impact (compare – impact v impact turn)

If no offense:

Grant defense. Close doors to prevent anything from turning into offense.

---

**AFFIRMATIVE TIPS AFTER THE NEGATIVE TRIED TO KICK THE DISAD**

Just because the negative tries to ignore or kick the disad, doesn’t mean you have to agree.

*If ignored by the negative,*

1. Extend your offense.
2. Explain.
3. Weight against the case.

**To make the turned disads stay... General Motto... Extend the offense**

If link turned:

- Extend and win uniqueness
- Extend and win the link turn
- Answer key defense

If impact turned:

- Extend the impact turns
- Answer any key defense
Topicality

Why might we have a resolution? What might happen without one?

Purpose(s) of Topicality:

How might you conceptualize topicality? PIZZA TIME!

Who runs it? When?
WHAT DETERMINES THE T VIOLATION?
PLAN!!!

STRUCTURE OF A TOPICALITY SHELL
A.
B.
C.
D.

COMMON NEGATIVE STANDARDS
1. Source and accessibility
2. Expertise
3. Ease / fairness of definition
4. The ground the definition establishes

COMMON VOTING ISSUES
1. Competitive Equity (stemming from ground)
2. Education (stemming from topic learning)

Let’s Practice
Advanced Topicality Concepts

EFFECTS:
What is your plan has the ingredients to make the pizza but it isn’t a pizza yet?
Is that fair? Why? Why not?

EXTRA:
What if your plan is outside the pizza? What if it is the table the pizza is on or the dog on the street?
Is that fair? Why? Why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Define</th>
<th>Why might be okay/good</th>
<th>Why might be bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFFIRMATIVE TOPICALITY ANSWERS**
A starting point for writing 2AC T blocks and answering T

1. we meet. reasons why the affirmative “meets the definition” and the negative definition doesn’t apply
2. negative interpretation is bad. The negative’s definition is bad for debate because
3. counter-definition/counter-interpretation. A better definition is...
4. we meet the counter-definition/counter-interpretation. Why the aff meets their own definition/interpretation
5. counter-standards. Affirmative definition is better b/c... it is better for our learning and here is why...
   a)
   b)
   c)
6. topicality is not a voting issue. Reasons why topicality isn’t important in this round
   [Example: Topicality is not a voting issue. Topicality is not a voting issue because there is no in round abuse – the negative has all solvency, link and uniqueness ground. We are not effects or extra. Our affirmative is predictable and fair.
   Example: There is no potential for abuse. We don’t set bad precedent - there is no potential for abuse]
Purpose:
Offer a competing, different proposal > affirmative plan

Why/When:
When the SQ is not good
Aff is true - esp if impacts about identity and real, personal issues
Despite H / adv truth - their mechanism/plan may have issues and you have evidence to prove alternative, better ways to get there
Need to say something and have evidence of competing mechanisms

When/What Speech Introduced/How to Introduce the Argument

Examples:
Types of Executive Action
Congress or Different Branches
Supreme Court of Different Branches
Government vs Private Sector

Parts of Affirmative not All of the Affirmative

Structure/Organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs. 1 Net Benefits/Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs. 2 Solvency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPTUALIZING COMPETITIVENESS

HOW TO COMETE:

NET BENEFITS:

PERMUTATIONS:
  Define:

  Examples:

UH OH....
WHAT HAPPENS IF THE AFFIRMATIVE HAS A PERMUTATION THAT IS:
  Define:       Good:       Bad:
1. SEVERENCE

2. INTRINSIC

3. TEMPORAL

Advanced concepts of competition:
TEXTUAL COMPETITION and FUNCTIONAL COMPETITION:

NOW... COMPARE WORLDS!!!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>SQ</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>PERM</th>
<th>MO PERMS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AFFIRMATIVE ANSWERS TO COUNTERPLANS**

Answering Counterplans...

Perms as a check on competitiveness

Perm Defined
  Theory of Permutations
    Might the Perm be... Severance, Intrinsic, Temporal

Theory of CP Advocacy
  Dispositional
  Conditional
  Unconditional (not much to say here)

Solvency Deficits

Disads to CP Action

A Strategy to Visualize Different Worlds...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Counterplan Alone</th>
<th>SQ</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>Perm 2 (if)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose(s)

Common Abbreviation and Why:

Why Run a Kritik?
When/How?

Common Structure:

Critique/K
A.
B.
C.

Types/Examples:

Vocabulary/Authors/Examples:

Fiat is a Myth/Debate is Just a Game
Pre-Fiat/Post-Fiat
Discourse/Rhetoric
“T”ruth (Relativism v Universalism)
Epistemology
Ontology
Genealogy
Representations
Performance
Consequentialism/
Utilitarianism v Deontology
Post-Modernity v Modernity/
Enlightenment
Empiricism and Positivism
Critical Legal Studies (CLS), Critical
Race Theory
Terror Talk/Terrorism/’Terrorist’
Orientalism/Other
Threat Construction, Spanos

Normativity
Anthropocentrism
Capitalism/Marxism
Objectivism (boo)
Foucault/Bio Power
Deleuze and Guattari
Wilderson
Hartman
Baudrillard
Hardt & Negri
Ableism
Afro-Pessimism
Racism
Classism
Gender/Feminism(s)
Intersectionality
Intersexuality
Patriarchy
Essentialism

Black & White Binaries
Hetero-normativity
Erasure/Gendered Language
Capitalism
Technology—Heidegger
Time—Virilio
Statism/Social Control
PsychoAnalysis—
Freud, Lacan, Zizek
Feminism(s)
Borders
Colonialism/Neocolonialism/
PostColonialism
Dillian/Securitization
Environmental Securitization
Kato “Nuclear War” 4th World
Militarism
Apocalyptic Language
Let’s Practice.

Listen to these arguments and write both a thesis and a possible structure to the K:

**Capitalism**
- A.
- B.
- C.

**Security**
- A.
- B.
- C.

**Pan/’Knowing’ China**
- A.
- B.
- C.

**Gender in IR/Gender Representations**
- A.
- B.
- C.

**Afro-Pessimism**
- A.
- B.
- C.

**Orientalism**
- A.
- B.
- C.

Thesis:
Affirmative Answers to Kritiks
General Ways of Responding to Kritiks

Respond just like any other 2AC response – number straight through and treat like any other type of argument…balance offense and defense!
Examples:

No Link

Is it a Disad without Uniqueness? Plan not Key? Link of Omission? Linear Impacts or Brink Impacts?
   No Discourse/PreFiat Implications. Gets evaluated at the same level as plan

How does your case interact with the K? Is your plan responsible for all of the harms of the K?

No Policy Implications (it doesn’t really mitigate solvency or turn it back)

No Alternative

Alternative Bad
   Transition
   Practicality
   Empiricism Good

Permutation—is the alternative competitive? Can you do both?

Framework/Philosophy Flawed

Method Bad

Method Doesn’t Solve

TURN TURN TURN!! Link Turn or Impact Turn
Counter-Critique and other offense

Performative Contradictions -
Consistency of Advocacy—watch for interaction with other positions

1AC IS ALWAYS READY AS OFFENSE! DEFEND STATE ACTION GOOD IN YOUR SPECIFIC INSTANCE. 1AC CAN SET UP THE FRAMEWORK OF CHOICE
Framework and the Role of the Ballot FRAMEWORK!

What Framework Is...

What Framework Is Not...

How to Use Framework...

What Might a 1AC Consider:

What Might a Critical 1NC Consider:

Points of Comparison/Points of Departure:
# Fundamental Impact Comparison: Setting Up Overviews

**Comparing Impacts: The Big 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Impact</th>
<th>Define</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>How to Use/Compare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magnitude</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Nuclear Explosion" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-Frame</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Clocks" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probability</strong></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Dice" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPARING IMPACTS: THE BIG 3

MAGNITUDE (M)

How do you compare?
Who wins?
What if?

Who wins?
1. Ex. 1? Why?
2. Ex. 2? Why?
3. Ex. 3? Why?

Debate examples?
Why?

Who?  When?

**EVEN IF****

What do to… What overviews can look and sound like.

What not to do….

Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways to OVERVIEW on the AFF</th>
<th>Ways to OVERVIEW on the NEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*no 1AR overview.</td>
<td>*Mini overview in negative block on each issue (regional overviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*no 2AC overview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AR overview is very important!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why? Compare the worlds!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning offense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Impact Turn or Link Turn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control uniqueness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-dating arguments with reason/warrants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Impact Calc thoughtfully… And against the other forms of Impact Calc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(link turn v link etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Out Weighs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Solves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predict and preempt the 2AR. Close doors.

Use Impact Calc thoughtfully
Magnitude, Probability, and/or Time frame)
(when disad occurs)
(link v link turn etc or impact v impact turn)

Controlling Uniqueness (if link turned)
While the cross-examination is not binding, it is VERY important. Please remember to include all cross-examination ‘victories’ into your speeches. It doesn’t count unless it is on the flow in a speech.

**Purpose:**

**Goals:**

**Prior Consideration:**
What kind of person are you? Identify your style... then work with it. Remember kindness! Consider introducing yourself to the other debater in your cross-examination. Be true to who you are and act with the best of intentions.

**Posture and Positioning:**
Establish your physical position. Stand (if available to you). Eye contact with judge. Professional. Non-verbal communication matters. You should:

**Crafting Questions**
Questions for Clarification:

Questions for Strategy Set Up:

Questions for Full Context of Argument:

**Lines of Questioning**
When: In History, Political timing
Where: Location, Geography, Culture, Socialization
Who/According to: Social location, Questions of Ability/Assumptions of Ability, Qualifications, Forms of Education
How: How do you know, What are your experiences
Epistemology: How did you come to learn this, How is this knowledge produced, Who benefits / Who loses based on this version of the information
Always: WHY/HOW

**Responding to Questions**
Pause Clarify Paraphrase. Think through questions and answer:

**How to deal with and work with:**
1. The Big Ego
2. The Angry
3. The Passive
4. The Rambler
5. The Silent
6. The staller/lost my papers/need to take a drink of water for 3 minutes/frantic.

PRACTICE! REVISE! WRITE NEW AFTER ROUNDS!
## CREATING THE NEGATIVE OPTIONS...

### ONE WAY TO STRATEGIZE NEGATIVE OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1NC</th>
<th>BLOCK (2NC/1NR)</th>
<th>2NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Options</td>
<td>List Combinations</td>
<td>List Combination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DEBATE STRATEGY SHEET (create your own—check options)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T Topicality Violations</th>
<th>BIT</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Artic. Aff</th>
<th>North Korea</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Cybersecurity</th>
<th>Intellectual</th>
<th>Human Rights</th>
<th>ADD:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Arguments, Advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers / Impact Answers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics DA - scenario—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations DA (China, Russia, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ/Spending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegemony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent CP (Courts, XO, Congress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterplans—EU, India, China, Russia (other country does or fund the plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatization CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan/Knowing China, Orientalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/IR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intro to Politics and Government
Identifying Basic American Political Identity Terms

Understanding the basic political landscape.
Who stands for what?
Does it really Matter?
Who falls where?
What kind of policies typically fall where?

“LEFT”   “CENTER”   “RIGHT”

Why might some people say politics is better described more as a circle than a linear line?
Intro to politics and government
Understand the basic structure / set up of government.
1. List the 3 branches and describe each of their functions.

2. Why are there 3 separate branches? Why? What is the point? Who controls each branch (if at all)?

3. Who/which branch technically/officially controls the budget?

4. What are the two bodies in the legislature?

5. Who is the Speaker of the House – what party?

6. Who is the Senate Majority Speaker – what party?

7. Who/what branch is in charge of enforcing the laws?

8. Who/what branch is in charge of reviewing policies for their Constitutionality?

9. Where does Foreign Policy fall?

10. What is bureaucracy?

11. What is gridlock? Why could it be both good and bad?

n and reflect on the following.
paperless, verbatim, dropbox, evidence sharing, + community norms
things i know now that i didn't know before...
Reflection & Epiphanies

things i know now that i didn't know before...