

# Table of Contents

## **Red/Maroon** Conference Argument

### Limits

## **Blue/Silver** Conference Argument

### Limits

## Ukraine AFFIRMATIVE

### (Rookie/Novice – Beginner)

#### Plan

**Plan: The United States federal government should end all direct commercial and foreign military sales of arms to Ukraine.**

#### Contention 1 - Inherency

Trump is currently committed to increasing arms sales to Ukraine.

#### Contention 2 is Harms – Ukraine Crisis

Arm sales entangle the US and Ukraine. This is bad because Ukraine uses its relations with the US to antagonize Russia.

U.S-Russia Military confrontation over Ukraine escalates to nuclear war.

#### Contention 3 is Solvency

Ending arms sales reduces tensions with Moscow and stops conflict escalation.

Plan solves – ending arms sales respects Russia's influence. That's key to better relations.

#### *[Optional]* Contention 4 is Harms

#### (China-Russia) Relations

Tensions with the US push Russia towards China. That improves China-Russian relations.

Creation of a Russia-China alliance fuels arctic militarization.

**Arctic militarization causes conflict escalation.  
Arctic conflict escalates to nuclear war.**

## **2AC/1AR Ukraine Affirmative**

### **Ukraine 2AC/1AR On Case Answers**

#### **2AC – Answers to Ukraine Crisis Harms**

##### **Frontline #1: Arms sales good turn**

1. Extend our Carpenter 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

2. The plan solves for Russia’s perceptions – it sees the provision of weapons as a provocation.

3. Arming Ukraine fails to deter Russia and results in entanglement which forces US escalation.

4. Arms won’t deter Russia – they cause conflict escalation and back the US into a corner.

#### **2AC – Answers to Ukraine Crisis Harms**

##### **Frontline #2: Democracy Turn**

1. Turn is Non-unique – Trump erodes global democracy.

2. They say arms sales to Ukraine show support for democracy, but Democracy promotion fails.

#### **2AC - Answers to Solvency Frontline #1: No solvency**

1. Extend our Carpenter 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

2. Extend our Carpenter 2017 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

3. They say sanctions mean we can’t solve, but arms sales ruin the remnants of bilateral relations between the US and Russia. Sanctions are priced into our evidence.

#### **2AC – Answers to Relations Harms Frontline #1: No China Russia Alliance**

1. Extend our Foy & Shephard 2019 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

Our Foy & Shephard 2019 evidence is better than their Freedberg 2018 evidence because

2. The depth of Chinese-Russian relations is determined by US foreign policy actions. US arms control policy pushes Russia toward China.

3 Plan allows the US to push Russia and China apart.

**2AC – Answers to Relations Harms Frontline # 2:**

**No arctic war**

1. Extend our Dillow 2018 evidence - it says

Our Dillow 2018 evidence is better than their Bergerson 2013 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Their evidence says that there are methods of dispute resolution, but existing framework is insufficient for current challenges.

4 US-Russia tensions hinder communication and cause escalation through miscalculation. Their evidence doesn't account for the current decline in relations.

**1AR – Answers to Ukraine Crisis Harms**

**Frontline #1: Arms sales good turn**

1. Extend our Wainer 2019 evidence \_\_\_\_\_

Our evidence is better than their Chalfant 2018 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Extend our Carpenter 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

Our evidence is better than their evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

3. Arms sales to Ukraine provoke Russia and embolden Ukraine it's a recipe for avoidable escalation.

**1AR - Answers to Ukraine Crisis Frontline #2:**

**Democracy Turn**

1. Extend our Tisdall 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

It's better than their Bremmer evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Trump causes global democratic decline through his other actions – arms sales to Ukraine won't do anything.

3. Extend our Larson 2012 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

It's better than their Democracy & Human Rights Working Group 2018 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

4 Democracy promotion is unattainable. US efforts in the middle east prove that democracy promotion cannot work

### **1AR - Answers to Solvency Frontline**

1. Extend our DePetris 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

Our evidence is better than their evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Yes Solvency, Russia wants to improve relations and Ukraine is key.

### **1AR – Answer to Relations Frontline #1: No Russia-China Alliance**

1. Extend our Foy & Shephard 2019 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

2. Extend our Chausovsky 2019 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

It's better than their Aron 2019 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

3. Skepticism about the possibility of deeper China-Russia ties ignores multiple reasons why their interests align.

### **1AR – Answers to Relations Frontline #2 – No Arctic War**

1. Extend our Long 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

It's better than their Byers 2017 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Current framework empirically fails - it's starting to break down right now.

## **Ukraine 2AC/1AR Answers to Off Case**

### **2AC – Frontline: Answers to Elections Disadvantage**

1. **Non-unique – Trump will win – he can win key swing states. Trump’s poll numbers are a floor, not a ceiling, and his popularity is growing.**
2. **No link threshold - Voters don’t care about foreign policy.**
3. **No impact – we’re past the tipping point and global warming is locked in.**

**1AR – EXTENSIONS Elections Frontline #1 – Non-unique**

1. **Extend our Olsen 2019 evidence - it says**

Our Olsen 2019 evidence is better than their Marcus 2018 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. **Non-unique – Trump’s approval is rising now. We win the disadvantage debate because \_\_\_\_\_**

**1AR – EXTENSIONS 2AC #2 - No threshold**

1. **Extend our Emerson Polling 2019 evidence - it says**

Our Emerson Polling 2019 evidence is better than their Lawler 2019 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. **Trump is vulnerable on health care.**
3. **Health care is the top issue in 2020.**
4. **We win the disadvantage debate because \_\_\_\_\_**

**1AR – EXTENSIONS to 2AC #3 – Past the Tipping point**

1. **Extend our Walker 2016 evidence - it says**

Our Walker 2016 evidence is better than their Melton 2019 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. **Global Warming feedback loops have already begun.**
3. **We win the disadvantage debate because \_\_\_\_\_**

**2AC- Frontline: Answers to Alliances Disadvantage**

1. **No link – arms sales are different from alliance commitments.**

- 2. Non-unique – Japanese remilitarization is inevitable
- 3. Turn – nuclear proliferation to democratic states like Japan is good.

**1AR – EXTENSION – 2AC Alliance**

**Disadvantage Frontline #1 – No Link**

1. Extend our Yarhi-Milo et al. 2017 evidence it says \_\_\_\_\_

This means the disadvantage doesn't link because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Arms sales are distinct from alliances and vary up and down over time. That means there's no link.

**1AR – EXTENSION – 2AC Alliance**

**Disadvantage Frontline # 2 – Non-unique**

1. Extend our Miura 2019 evidence it says \_\_\_\_\_

It's better than their Kaplan 2019 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Japanese politicians are signaling they support nukes – they have the technical capabilities and are hoarding materials.

**1AR EXTENSIONS to # 3 – Prolif Good**

1. Extend our Carpenter 2004 evidence - it says

Our Carpenter 2004 evidence is better than their evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---



---



---



---

2. India-Pakistan are historical proof that nuclear proliferation solves conflict.

3 We win the disadvantage debate because \_\_\_\_\_

**2AC Ukraine Answers to Topicality-Substantial**

1. We meet – We reduce foreign military sales by more than 2%.

A) US Foreign Military Sales totaled \$55.6 billion in Fiscal Year 2018.

**B) Ukraine wants to request \$2.25 billion from the US. That's four percent of foreign military sales.**

**2. Counter interpretation: The affirmative must defend reducing arms sales by a considerable amount. "Substantial" means of real worth or considerable value --- this is the USUAL and CUSTOMARY meaning of the term**

**3. Counter-standards:**

**A. Education – our interpretation allows debates on Affirmative cases about Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Ukraine, Taiwan, Japan, and other countries at the forefront of debates about US arms sales.**

**4. Their standards for Topicality are bad:**

**A. They say their interpretation is key to limits but it over limits. The Trump administration has massively increased arms sales to Ukraine from the Obama era and shifted US strategy with Russia. Debates about arms sales to Ukraine are important to understand foreign policy.**

**B. They say their interpretation is good for ground. Their interpretation eliminates all country specific affirmative cases – those are key to links for the alliance DA, the containment DA, and other arguments about international relations.**

**C. Topicality is not a voter – default to reasonability. Competing interpretations causes a race to the bottom and crowds out substance.**

## **2AC Frontline: Answers to Consult NATO Counterplan**

**1. No SOLVENCY: NATO says no – it wants to improve Ukraine's defense capabilities.**

**2. Consultation doesn't solve - Democratic backsliding within NATO is the real issue that fuels disunity.**

**Katz & Taussig 2018**

**3. No impact to terrorism – It's unrealistic and we should focus on controlling convention weapons such as the plan.**

**4. Permutation: do both – consultation with NATO is just an addition to the plan. Thus, it doesn't compete.**

## **1AR – EXTENSIONS TO 2AC – Frontline #1 – NATO Says No**

**1. Extend our Al-Jazeera 2019 evidence - it says**

---

**Our Al Jazeera 2019 evidence is better than their Marcus 2018 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_**

**2. Empirically proven that NATO will say no - it is supplying Ukraine’s military.**

**3 We win the counterplan debate because**

**1AR – EXTENSIONS TO 2AC – Frontline #2 – Consultation doesn’t solve**

**1. Extend our Katz & Taussig 2018 evidence - it says**

**Our Katz & Taussig 2018 evidence is better than their evidence because \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Consultation doesn’t solve - NATO’s problems are structural and consultation on the plan won’t fix them.**

**3 We win the counterplan debate because**

\_\_\_\_\_

**1AR – EXTENSIONS TO 2AC – Frontline #3 – No impact**

**1. Extend our Ward 2018 evidence - it says**

**Our Ward 2018 evidence is better than their UCS 2008 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**2. No impact -- the risk of a successful attack is highly improbable.**

**3 We win the counterplan debate because**

\_\_\_\_\_

**1AR – EXTENSION TO Permutation - do both**



1. They say the plan and counterplan are mutually exclusive – they aren't because the counterplan just involves additional parties in the plan. This means that it's just an addition to the plan and is not competitive.
2. They say it competes on certainty – this is unfair because there's an infinite number of ways for the negative to make the plan less certain. For example, the neg could read the "flip a coin" counter plan. This is a bad model for debate.

## **Taiwan AFFIRMATIVE (Intermediate – JV)**

### **Plan**

**Plan: The United States  
federal government should  
end its arms sales to Taiwan.**

### **Contention 1: Harms – Taiwan Crisis**

Tensions between the US, Taiwan, and China are on the brink.

Trump is about to cross a redline with China by selling F16 jets. China has warned the US not to do this.

Taiwan crisis escalates to nuclear war. Changing US foreign policy is key.

### **Contention 2: Harms – Relations**

US-China relations are in free fall. Reversing the direction of US policies is key.

Declining relations stops cooperation on climate change.

Time is running out to solve global warming. Failure to act now results in tipping points that make the world uninhabitable.

### **Contention 3 is Solvency**

Only the plan solves – ending Taiwan arms sales ends US-China competition

Ending US arms sales to Taiwan respects China's core interests and solves relations.

## **2AC/1AR Taiwan Affirmative**

### **2AC/1AR Answers to Taiwan Crisis**

#### **Adv.**

#### **2AC - Answers to 1NC Taiwan Crisis #1 – Appeasement Turn**

They say that appeasement is bad because it leads to China invading Taiwan. But status quo foreign policy of containment makes war inevitable. Only de-escalating tensions through the plan solves.

#### **2AC - Answer to Status Quo is the best option**

1. Extend our 1AC Seligman 2019 evidence – the US is on the verge of selling F16s to China that violate its core interests – this will drastically alter the status quo if it happens. This means that even if you think the current balance is good, voting negative won't preserve it because Trump disrupts it with his sales.

2. Continued US support makes it difficult to deescalate conflict.

#### **2AC - Answers to 1NC Taiwan Crisis #3 – Taiwan Proliferation**

Impact turn - Spread of nuclear weapons is good – it increases international stability.

#### **1AR – Containment Turn**

Extend our Cordesman 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

It is better than their evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

Attempts to contain China cause strategic miscalculation and cause Chinese invasion by 2020.

### **1AR Answer to – Status quo is the best option**

1. Extend our 1AC Seligman 2019 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

This evidence is better than their Bush 2019 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Extend our 2AC Carpenter 2019 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

It's better than their Haas 2019 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

3. Trump's plans for future arms sales to Taiwan wreck the strategic balance. It's not a choice between the current policies and the plan, but between the plan and new arms sales that signal drastic shifts in US commitments.

### **1AR – Extension – Impact Turn: Prolif Good**

1. Extend our Shellenberger 2018 that says \_\_\_\_\_

It's better than their evidence \_\_\_\_\_

2. Nuclear proliferation is good – increasing the number of states with nuclear weapons increases global stability, reduces miscalculation, and decreases chance of war.

## **2AC/1AR Answers to Relations Adv.**

### **2AC - Answers to 1NC Relations #1: alt causes**

Taiwan is a key interest of China's.  
Status quo promises worse relations specifically because of arms sales. Plan solves.

### **2AC - Answers to Relations Frontline #2: Can't Solve Warming**

Even while Trump is president, there are other opportunities for cooperation with China on Climate Change.

### **2AC - Answers to Relations Frontline #3: Democracy Turn**

1. Their turns are Non unique – Trump erodes global democracy.
2. They say arms sales to Taiwan show support for democracy, but Democracy promotion fails.

**3. Democracy is not key – China is the global leader on meeting climate targets.**

**1AR – Answers to: 1NC Relations Frontline #1 - Alt Causes**

**1. Extend our Xinhua 2019 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**You should prefer our evidence because \_\_\_\_\_**

**2. Extend our Vivian 2019 evidence \_\_\_\_\_**

**3. The plan is a dream come true for China. It has wanted an end of arms sales for decades.**

**1AR – Answers to: Relations Frontline #2 – No Solvency**

**1. Extend our Bappa 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_**

**It's better than their Ross 2019 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_**

**2. China-US cooperation is still possible through green tech companies, but tensions derail technology adoption and investment.**

**1AR – Answers to: Relations Frontline #3 – Democracy Turn**

**1. Extend our Tisdall 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Prefer it over their Bremmer 2017 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_**

**2 Trump causes global democratic decline through his other actions – arms sales to Ukraine are a drop in the bucket.**

**3) This means we win the case turn debate because \_\_\_\_\_**

**4) Extend our Larson 12 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Our evidence is better than their Democracy and Human Rights Working Group 2018 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 5) **Democracy promotion is unattainable. US efforts in the middle east prove that democracy promotion cannot work**
- 6) **This means we win the case turn debate because** \_\_\_\_\_
- 7) **Extend our Ye 2018 evidence - it says** \_\_\_\_\_  
**It's better than their Westcott 2019 evidence because** \_\_\_\_\_
- 8) **China can implement top down policies to address warming.**
- 9) **This means we win the case turn debate because** \_\_\_\_\_

## **Taiwan 2AC/1AR Answers to Off Case**

### **2AC Frontline: Answers to Elections**

#### **Disadvantage**

- 1. **Approval ratings don't matter - Even if Trump's approval ratings are low, their consistency shows the strength of his base.**
- 2. **Non-unique – Trump will win. Tons of factors favor him.**
- 3. **No internal link - Democrats will lose the Senate. That means their agenda is a nonstarter.**

#### **1AR – Extensions to 2AC #1 – Approval ratings don't matter**

- 1. **Extend our Vittert & Lind 2019 evidence - it says**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Our Vittert & Lind 2019 evidence is better than their Longman 2019 evidence because**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 2. **Default effect means that Trump will win even if people are unhappy.**
- 3. **We win the disadvantage debate because** \_\_\_\_\_

**1AR – Extensions to 2AC #2 – Non-unique**

- 1. Extend our Continetti 2019 evidence - it says

Our Continetti 2019 evidence is better than their evidence because

- 2. Trump wins in 2020 because of incumbent advantage and strong economy.
- 3 We win the disadvantage debate because

**1AR – Extensions to 2AC #3 – No internal link**

- 1. Extend our Golshan & Nielsen 2019 evidence - it says

Our Golshan & Nielsen 2019 evidence is better than their Longman 2019 evidence because

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 2. They say that Democrats can put us back in Paris climate accord, but Paris fails to avert catastrophic warming.

- 3 We win the disadvantage debate because

**2AC Frontline: Answers to Alliances**

**Disadvantage**

- 1. No link - Ending arms sales doesn't trigger abandonment fears for Japan.
- 2. No link – Japan's main priority is peace and stability with China. Plan is in line with Japan's interests.
- 3. No internal link – Japan won't pursue nuclear weapons. Past predictions have been wrong.

**1AR EXTENSIONS TO #1 – No Link**

- 1. Extend our Glaser 2015 evidence - it says

Our Glaser 2015 evidence is better than their evidence because

- 2. No link – Japan wants to avoid US intervention in Taiwan.
- 3 We win the disadvantage debate because

**1AR EXTENSIONS TO #2 – No link**

**1. Extend our Hornung 2018 evidence - it says**

Our Hornung 2018 evidence is better than their Twining 2013 evidence because

**2. Japan wants the US and China to reduce tensions now. It's caught in the middle.**

**3 We win the disadvantage debate because**

**1 AR EXTENSIONS TO # 3 – No Internal Link**

**1. Extend our Dutta 2018 evidence - it says**

Our Dutta 2018 evidence is better than their evidence because

**2. Japan won't get nukes – the public and government oppose nuclear weapons.**

**3 We win the disadvantage debate because**

**2AC Taiwan Answers to Topicality-Substantial**

**1. We meet – plan stops at least \$8 billion in foreign military sales.**

**A. US Foreign Military Sales totaled \$55.6 billion in Fiscal Year 2018.**

**B. State Department has proposed \$8 billion in Foreign Military Sales to Taiwan. Plan stops those that means we reduce sales by 14%.**

**2. Counter interpretation: The affirmative must defend reducing arms sales by a considerable amount. "Substantial" means of real worth or considerable value --- this is the USUAL and CUSTOMARY meaning of the term**

**3. Counter-Standards**

**A. Limits – the negative has a variety of counterplans that allow them to steal the affirmative case such as the conditions CP or Consult CP. These provide a functional limit on the topic.**

**B. Education – our interpretation allows debates on affirmatives about Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Ukraine, Taiwan, Japan, and other countries at the forefront of debates about US arms sales.**

**4 Their Standards are bad**

**A. They say their interpretation is key to limits but it over limits. Arms sales to Taiwan are one of the most important issues in arms sales because of their**

**substantial importance to China. This is critical to learning about US foreign policy in East Asia.**

**B. They say their interpretation is good for ground. Their interpretation eliminates all country specific affirmatives – those are key to links for the alliance DA, the containment DA, and other arguments about international relations.**

**C. Topicality is not a voter – default to reasonability. Competing interpretations causes a race to the bottom and crowds out substance.**

## **2AC Frontline: Answers to Consult NATO Counterplan**

**1. No SOLVENCY: NATO says no - Germany and France are drawing closer to Taiwan now and don't want abandonment.**



**2. NATO Bad turn - NATO does not deter Russia and instead antagonizes it, creating a massive risk of conflict.**

**3. Deterrence fails – it doesn’t work against non-state terrorists. There’s no impact to the net benefit.**

**4. Permutation: do both – consultation with NATO is just an addition to the plan. Thus, the counterplan doesn’t compete.**

**1AR – EXTENSIONS TO 2AC Frontline #1 – Say**

**No**

**1. Extend our Politico 2019 evidence - it says**

**Our Politico 2019 evidence is better than their evidence because \_\_\_\_\_**

**2. NATO says no - it’s worried about China military expansion.**

**3. NATO says no – US allies are committed to freedom of navigation.**

**4. If we win that NATO says no, you vote aff and the case outweighs the net benefit because \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**1AR – EXTENSIONS TO 2AC Frontline #3 –**

**Deterrence fails**

**1. Extend our Thompson 2014 evidence - it says**

**Our Thompson 2014 evidence is better than their Trager & Zagorcheva 2006 evidence because \_\_\_\_**

**2. Deterrence fails for terrorist groups because there are no mutual rules and no return address.**

**3 We win the counterplan debate because**

**1AR – EXTENSIONS TO Permutation - do both**

**1. They say the plan and counterplan is mutually exclusive – they aren’t because the counterplan just involves additional parties in the plan. This means that it’s just an addition to the plan and is not competitive.**

2. They say it competes on certainty – this is unfair. There’s an infinite number of ways for the negative to make the plan less certain – for example, the neg could read the “flip a coin” counter plan. This is a bad model for debate.

3 We win the counterplan debate because

---

## **Saudi Arabia AFFIRMATIVE (Advanced - Varsity)**

### **Plan**

**Plan: The United States federal government should institute an embargo on arms sales to Saudi Arabia.**

### **Contention 1 - Harms: Yemen Crisis**

**US arms sales to Saudi Arabia fuel the conflict in Yemen.**

**Saudia Arabia’s war in Yemen creates an ongoing humanitarian crisis. There are preventable deaths happening constantly.**

**US arms sales uniquely enable Saudi Arabia’s ongoing genocide in Yemen.**

**Only ending arms sales can bring an end to hostilities.**

**The plan solves. Ending arms sales results in Saudi withdrawal because it depends on US support.**

### **Contention 2 - Harms: Reform**

**Continuing arms sales greenlights Saudi human rights violations at home. Ending arms sales is key.**

**Ending arms sales pressures Saudi Arabia.**

**Increasing pressure now is key to end the guardianship system.**

Saudi Arabia AFFIRMATIVE (Advanced - Varsity)—Chicago Debates High  
School Core Files 2019-2020

**The guardianship system denies women basic rights  
and perpetuates gendered violence.**

**This everyday violence against Saudi Women must be prioritized because it's a pre-requisite to all other forms of violence.**

## **2AC/1AR Saudi Arabia Affirmative**

### **2AC/1AR Answers to Yemen Crisis**

#### **Adv.**

#### **2AC – Answer to Yemen Crisis Frontline #1 - Fill in**

**They say “China will fill in”, but China can’t fill in US weapons sales.**

#### **2AC – Answers to Yemen Crisis Frontline #2 – Support Good**

**Ending arms sales is key to deescalate the conflict – Saudi Arabia can’t act without US arms.**

**Ending arms sales solves bombings and blockades –  
that’s the major cause of mass suffering.**

**1AR – Answers to Yemen Crisis Frontline #1 -Fill  
in**

1. Extend our Zheng 2018 evidence - it  
says \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

It’s better than their evidence  
because \_\_\_\_\_

2. There’s no fill in specifically in the case of Saudi  
Arabia – it is extremely dependent on US weapons

**1AR – Answers to Yemen Crisis Frontline #2 –  
Support Good**

Even if civil war continues, its preferable to the  
ongoing blockade.

**2AC/1AR Answers to Harms - Reform**

**2AC – Answer to Harms - Reform Frontline #1 –  
Reform Fails**

Only US pressure can create reforms because of prince  
Mohammed Bin Salman’s consolidation of power.

**2AC – Answer to Harms - Reform Frontline #2 –  
No Pressure**

1. Extend our Caverly 2018 evidence – ending arms  
sales pressures Saudi Arabia. This creates change  
because our Alkhudary & Anderson 2019 evidence  
says that right now there is a window to push women’s  
rights reform in Saudi Arabia but we have to increase  
pressure. The plan does that.

2. Arms sales are uniquely key to pressure Saudi  
Arabia.

3. Status quo foreign policy greenlights human rights  
abuses – plan reverses that.

**2AC – Answers to Harms - Reform Frontline #3 –  
Oil Prices Turn**

1. High oil prices good turn - High prices increase renewable energy use.
2. No diversionary war – Trump diverts attention with other means.
3. No internal link uniqueness – Trade war makes economic downturn inevitable.

### **1AR – Answers to: Harms - Reform Frontline #1 – Reform Fails**

1. Extend our Al-Rasheed 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

–  
It's better than their Al-Khamir 2018 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

- 2 Their evidence ignores how status quo US foreign policy shields Prince MBS from criticism. US pressure is key to effective reform.

### **1AR – Answers to Harms - Reform Frontline #2 – No Pressure**

Arms embargoes do effectively create changes in state policy – history proves

### **1AR – Answers to Harms - Reform Frontline #3 – Oil Prices Turn**

Extend our high oil prices good turn - They say that low oil prices drive up natural gas prices, but that's wrong.

1. Oil and natural gas prices are tied together.
2. Falling oil prices are bad – drive down gas prices and kill electric vehicles.
3. No diversionary war – Extend our Bershidsky 2017 evidence \_\_\_\_\_

Our evidence is better than their Foster 2016 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

## **2AC/1AR Answers to Framing – Utilitarianism Good**

### **2AC – Answers to Negative Framing Frontline**

1. Cross Apply our 1AC – Reform Advantage Schepper-Bourgois 4 evidence it says \_\_\_\_\_
2. Our impacts outweigh their impacts - the slow violence caused by invisible conflict that causes exponential death.

- 3. **Focusing on the biggest risk, no matter how unlikely, ruins decision making and makes change impossible.**

**Saudi Arabia 2AC/1AR Answers to Off Case**

**2AC – Front Line: Answers to Elections**

**Disadvantage**

- 1. **Polls Fail** - At best polls can predict national vote, but fail at the state level. Means they can't predict the electoral college.
- 2. **No link uniqueness and no link** – Trump is already winning on foreign policy.
- 3. **No Internal link** - If Democrats don't win the Senate, then they can't solve warming.

**1AR – EXTENSIONS TO 2AC #1 polls fail**

- 1. **Extend our Berly 2018 evidence - it says**

Our Berly 2018 evidence is better than their Williams 2018 evidence because

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

- 2. **Predictive models can't account for major variables or unexpected events. This means their Disadvantage is a bunch of nonsense.**

**1AR – EXTENSTIONS TO 2AC #2 – No link uniqueness and no link**

- 1. **Extend our Ward 2019 evidence - it says**

Our Ward 2019 evidence is better than their Smeltz 2019 evidence because

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**2. Trump has numerous foreign policy wins – at best the links to the plan are a drop in the bucket.**

**1AR – EXTENSIONS TO 2AC #3 – No Internal Link**

**1. Extend our Hunt 2019 evidence - it says**

---

**Our Hunt 2019 evidence is better than their Williams 2018 evidence because**

---

**2 No impact to rejoining Paris - it fails to avert catastrophic warming.**

**2AC – Frontline: Answers to Alliances Disadvantage**

**1. No link - Credibility theory is false. All it does is lock in diplomatic rigidity.**



**2. No threshold – US-Japan alliance is durable.**

**3. No world war – several factors ensure stable peace and no war between great powers.**

**1AR EXTENSIONS TO #1 – Credibility Theory**

**Wrong**

**1. Extend our Walt 2012 evidence - it says**

**Our Walt 2012 evidence is better than their Williams 2018 evidence because**

---

---

---

---

---

---

**2. We should question theories about credibility since it's difficult to define.**

**1AR EXTENSIONS TO #2 – Alliance is durable**

**1. Extend our CRS 2019 evidence - it says**

**Our CRS 2019 evidence is better than their evidence because**

---

---

---

---

---

---

**2. US-Japan alliance is based on mutual commitment and benefit. No risk of weakening.**

**1AR EXTENSIONS TO #3 – No great power war**

**1. Extend our Aziz 2014 evidence - it says**

**Our Aziz 2014 evidence is better than their evidence because**

---

---

---

---

---

---

**2. War between great powers is obsolete.**

### **2AC Saudi Arabia Answers to T-Substantial**

**1. We meet – We reduce sales by more than 2%.**

**The plan reduces sales by at least \$35 billion - that's way more than 2%.**

**2. Counter interpretation: The affirmative must defend reducing arms sales by a considerable amount. "Substantial" means of real worth or considerable value --- this is the USUAL and CUSTOMARY meaning of the term**

**3. Counter-Standards**

**A. Limits – the negative has a variety of counterplans that allow them to steal the affirmative case such as the conditions CP or Consult CP. These provide a functional limit on the topic.**

**B. Education – our interpretation allows debates on affirmatives about Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Ukraine, Taiwan, Japan, and other countries at the forefront of debates about US arms sales.**

**4) Their Standards are bad –**

**A. They say their interpretation is key to limits but it over limits. Saudi Arabia is America's number 1 customer for arms sales, under their interpretation ending all arms sales to Saudi Arabia is not topical. This means that every country isn't topical. They say they set an objective limit but it's arbitrary.**

**B. They say their interpretation is good for ground. Their interpretation eliminates all country specific affirmatives – those are key to links for the alliance DA, the containment DA, and other arguments about international relations.**

**C. Topicality is not a voter – default to reasonability. Competing interpretations causes a race to the bottom and crowds out substance.**

### **2AC Frontline: Answers to Consult NATO**

#### **Counterplan**

**1. No SOLVENCY - NATO says no – European allies opposed Germany's ban on sales to Saudi Arabia.**

**2. NATO Bad - NATO justifies imperialistic wars and wants to expand.**

**3 NATO expansion is bad and causes more war, destruction, and insecurity.**

**4. Permutation: do both – consultation with NATO is just an addition to the plan. Thus, it doesn't compete.**

**1AR EXTENSIONS TO 2AC ANSWERS TO #1–**

**Say no**

**1. Extend our Economist 2019 evidence - it says**

**Our Economist 2019 evidence is better than their Der Spiegel 2019 evidence because**

---

---

---

---

---

---

**2. Disagreement over Saudi arms sales mean that the counterplan causes disagreement and infighting in NATO – there is no consensus for the plan.**

**1AR EXTENSIONS TO 2AC ANSWERS TO #2 – NATO Bad**

**1. Extend the NATO Bad turn – Our Flowers & Zeese 2019 evidence says**

---

---

---

**And our extend our Cohen 2017 evidence - it says**

**Prefer our evidence to their Stavridis 2019 evidence because**

**2. They say that declining commitment causes miscalculation, but the risk of conflict and miscalculation is worse in the status quo because**

**3. NATO does not deter Russia and instead antagonizes it, creating a massive risk of conflict.**

**1AR EXTENSIONS TO 2AC ANSWERS TO #4**

**Permutation: do both**

**1. They say the plan and counterplan are mutually exclusive – they aren't because the counterplan just**

Ukraine Case Negative—Chicago Debates High School Core Files 2019-2020

**involves additional parties in the plan. This means that it's just an addition to the plan and is not competitive.**

**2. They say it competes on certainty – this is unfair because there's an infinite number of ways for the Negative to make the plan less certain. For example, the Negative could read the flip a coin counter plan. This is a bad model for debate.**

## **Ukraine Case Negative**

### **1NC Answers to Harms #1 - Ukraine Crisis Adv.**

**1. Arms sales good turn – Their Semchuck 2019 evidence says the US is going to expand arms sales to Ukraine. That's good.**

**A. Putin's popularity is low now, which means the risk of diversionary war is high. Expanding arms sales are key to stop him.**

**B) Ukraine is the most important place for containment. Arms sales are key.**

**C. Failure to check Russia causes war between great powers – this turns the case.**

**2. Democracy turn – US support for Ukraine through arms sales demonstrates support for democracy.**

**3 US Support for democracy is critical to challenge the spread of authoritarianism. That's key to global stability and turns their case.**

**1NC Answers to Harms #2 - Relations**

**1. Alliance won't happen in the arctic – China and Russia have major disagreements.**

**2. No arctic war – countries have set up peaceful methods of dispute resolution.**

**1NC Answers to Solvency**

No solvency – US sanctions on Russia prevent relations improvements.

**2NC/1NR – EXT – Harms #1 (Ukraine Crisis)**

**Frontline #1- Arms Sales Good Turn**

**1. Extend our arms sales good turn – extend our 1NC Bloomberg 2018 evidence - it says that right now Putin becoming more aggressive because**

---

**2. Extend our McFaul 2018 evidence - it says**

---

**3. This turns the case because**

---

**4. They say that arms sales provoke Russia, but our Bloomberg 2018 evidence says**

---

---

---

**5. And, Russia is testing the US in Ukraine. A weak response now greenlights aggression.**

**6. Arms sales are key to deter the aggression of Russia.**

**7. They say deterrence fails, but deterrence succeeds.**

**2NC/1NR – EXT – Harms (Ukraine Crisis)**

**Frontline #2- Democracy Turn**

**1. Extend our Democracy turn – extend our 1NC Green 2018 evidence - it says that**

---

**2. Extend our Abrams 2016 evidence - it says**

---

**3. This turns the case because**

---

**4. They say Trump non-uniques the turn, but commitment to Ukraine shoes support for democracy.**

**5. They say democracy promotion fails, but US leadership on democracy is key.**

## **2NC/1NR – EXT – Answer to Harms – Relations**

### **#1: “No Alliances”**

1. Extend our Freedberg 2018 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

—  
Our Freedberg 2018 evidence is better than their evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Relations won't get closer – there's tons of barriers.

## **2NC/1NR – EXT -Harms #2 (Relations) #2 – No**

### **Arctic War**

1. Extend our Borgerson 2013 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

—  
Our Borgerson 2013 evidence is better than their Dillow 2018 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Arctic institutions are resilient – they are designed in a way that ensures support even in crisis.

## **2NC/1NR – Ext Solvency - #1 – No Solvency**

1. Extend our Meredith & Turak 2019 evidence \_\_\_\_\_

—  
Our evidence is better than their DePetris evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. No solvency - Sanctions lock in the decline of US-Russia relations.

## **Elections Disadvantage v. Ukraine**

### **1NC Elections Disadvantage Shell (against Ukraine Aff)**

A. UNIQUENESS: Democrats are on track to win in 2020, but it's not a guarantee.

B. LINK: Plan makes Democrats look weak on Russia.

C. IMPACT – Re-electing Trump causes extinction because of global warming.

### **2NC or 1NR Answers to Non-unique**

Even if Trump is gaining popularity, he still loses to the democrats.



Ukraine Case Negative—Chicago Debates High School Core Files 2019-2020

**The most accurate models predict Trump will lose now.**

**2NC or 1NR Answers to Link Wall**

**The plan is normal means. The regular arms sales process means Congress gets blamed, not Trump. GOP are extremely loyal to Trump and Dems vote against him. This means that it's the Democrats who kill Ukraine arms sales.**

**Americans dislike Russia due to Ukraine – the plan is unpopular.**

**2NC or 1NR: We're past the tipping point**

**It's try or die to solve warming.**

**Alliances Disadvantage vs. Ukraine**

**1NC Alliances DA Shell (against Ukraine Aff)**

**A. Uniqueness - US-Japan alliance is stronger than ever, but it can be disrupted.**

**B. LINK: Breaking with Ukraine assurances undermines US credibility.**

**C. INTERNAL LINK: Japan will pursue nuclear weapons if it doubts the alliance.**

**D. IMPACT: Japan nuclearization escalates to all out war.**

**2NC or 1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #1 – No link**

**Japan looks at other alliances to check US commitment.**

**Unilateral reversal of Ukraine policy demoralizes allies.**

**2NC or 1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #2 -Non-unique**

**Japan won't re-nuclearize unless the alliance falls apart – only the plan causes that.**

**Japan can obtain nuclear weapons in six months.**

**2NC or 1NR Answers to 2AC #3 – Prolif bad**

**Japanese acquisition of nuclear weapons causes first strikes on North Korea.**

**Proliferation causes extinction.**

**1NC Topicality Shell vs. Ukraine**

**1NC Topicality (vs. Ukraine Affirmative)**

**A. Interpretation: The US must reduce arms sales by at least \$3.846 billion.**

**1. "Substantial" must be at least 2%**

**2. Foreign military sales and direct commercial sales totaled \$192.3 billion.**

**B. Violation: Ukraine sales totaled 47 million in 2018.**

**C. Standards**

**1. Limits – a quantitative standard for substantial is an objective bright line. This is key because the US supplies arms to over 98 countries. Without an objective limit the negative cannot properly prepare for all the country specific affirmatives.**

**2. Ground – a percentage reduction is key to ensure that the negative can link core topic generic arguments like the Alliances DA, Defense Industrial Base DA, and the elections DA. If the reduction is too small, then the negative loses out on disadvantages.**

**D. Topicality is a voter for fairness and education.**

## **2NC/1NR Block for Topicality vs. Ukraine**

### **2NC/1NR Block for Topicality-Substantial (against Ukraine Aff.)**

**A. Extend our interpretation – The US must reduce arm sales by \$3.846 billion.**

**B. Extend our definition. Substantial is 2%, that's according to Words and Phrases 1960. You should prefer our evidence to their Words and phrases 2002 evidence because**

---

**Extend our Macdonald 2018 evidence - it says that the US foreign military sales and direct commercial sales of arms totaled \$192.3 billion.**

**C. Extend our violation – the plan does not reduce arms sales by at least \$3.846 billion because US arms sales to Ukraine were on \$47 million in 2018. That's way less than \$3.846 billion.**

**D. On to the standards –**

**1. Extend our limits argument – only a numerical limit such as our interpretation can set an objective standard to determine which affirmatives are topical. They say that we over limit – even if we over limit, over limiting is better than under limiting because it's**

**fairer to the negative. The affirmative gets to choose the specific topic of discussion and a more limited topic protects neg preparation.**

**2. Extend our ground argument – a sizable percentage reduction is key to neg links to core topic generic arguments such as the alliance DA or the Elections DA. That’s key to competitive equity. They say that our interpretation eliminates all country specific affs – even if that’s true for smaller countries, the aff can defend reducing significant arms sales to Saudi Arabia, which would be Topical and educational to debate**

**3. Topicality is a voter for fairness and education. You should default to competing interpretations:**

**a. it’s the best way to prevent judges from intervening based on their own opinion of what should be debated.**

**b. There’s no clear standard for what is reasonably topical.**

*On to their side of the flow –*

**1. Their interpretation provides no limit on the topic – they offer no way to determine what counts as having real worth or considerable value.**

**2. They say their interpretation is better for ground – country specific affirmatives are impossible for the neg to engage specifically. We sell arms to 97 countries. This means that we need to prepare 97 case negs under their topic. That’s impossible.**

## **1NC Consult NATO vs. Ukraine**

**COUNTERPLAN TEXT: The United States federal government should enter into a prior binding consultation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) about whether it should**

**end its arms sales to Ukraine and  
abide by NATO's decision.**

Ukraine Case Negative—Chicago Debates High School Core Files 2019-2020

**A. Trump does not consult NATO about foreign policy decisions and takes unilateral action.**

**B. Consultation through NATO is key to developing a common strategic purpose.**

Ukraine Case Negative—Chicago Debates High School Core Files 2019-2020

**C. Common NATO strategy is key to deter terrorism.**

**D. IMPACT: Terrorism will go nuclear – it can happen.**

**E. IMPACT: Nuclear terrorism sparks retaliatory escalation that results in nuclear war.**

**F. SOLVENCY: NATO says yes – it wants to avoid Ukraine escalation.**

**2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #1 – NATO says no**

NATO says yes – its members oppose weapons sales. Even if they win that Ukraine says no, weigh the counterplan against the plan. Our net benefit of NATO cohesion outweighs their case because

---

**2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #2 – Consultation Doesn't Solve**

Trump's lack of faith in NATO is its biggest problem. It won't change in the status quo without the counterplan.



Ukraine Case Negative—Chicago Debates High School Core Files 2019-2020

**Mattis' resignation creates greater uncertainty from**

**Trump's lack of consultation.**

**Consultation solves cohesion.**

**Consultation is key to unity.**

**2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #3 – No**

**Nuclear Terrorism**

**Nuclear terrorism is a big risk – the US needs to take it seriously.**

**Even if the probability is low, you should prioritize preventing nuclear terrorism because of its large magnitude.**

**2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #4 –  
Permutation: Do Both**

- 1. Mutual exclusivity – the Plan is a unilateral action, while the counterplan is multilateral. You can't do both at the same time.**
- 2. Certainty – the Plan is certain, while the counterplan is uncertain—reducing arms sales only happens if NATO says yes. This means that you can't do both because going ahead with the plan no matter what defeats the purpose of consultation.**

## **Taiwan Case Negative**

### **HARMS - Taiwan Crisis Answers**

#### **1NC HARMS – Taiwan Crisis Frontline**

- 1. Appeasement turn -**
  - A) The plan is accommodation that emboldens Chinese aggression.**
  - B) That results in Chinese invasion of Taiwan. Pressure on Xi from his own party means that perception of US weakness causes Chinese invasion of Taiwan.**
- 2. Status quo is the best option – currently, strategic risks balance on the Chinese and Taiwanese sides and prevents rash action by either.**
- 3. Taiwan proliferation turn –**
  - A) Reduction in commitment to Taiwan causes it to pursue nuclear weapons. Specifically, US support gives us leverage that back stops proliferation.**
  - B) Taiwan pursuit of nuclear weapons causes Chinese first strikes.**

#### **2NC/ 1NR HARMS – #1 Appeasement**

**Appearance of a lack of commitment from the US causes China to wage expansionary war.**

#### **2NC/1NR HARMS – #2 Status quo is the best option**

**No serious risk of conflict in the status quo.**

#### **2nc/1nr HARMS – # 3 – Taiwan prolif**

**Nuclear proliferation in Asia risks nuclear war**

# Solvency ANSWERS

## 1NC SOLVENCY Answers

1. Trade war wrecks relations – plan can't solve.

## 2NC/1NR ext – HARMS - Solvency Frontline #1 –

### Alt Causes

1. Extend our 1NC Lee 2019 evidence – it says \_\_\_\_\_

It's better than their Xinhua 2019 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Continued escalation of trade war means plan can't solve.

# HARMS - Relations Answers

## 1NC HARMS – Relations Frontline

1. We can't solve warming because Trump is president.

2. Democracy turn –

A) The US and Taiwan are increasing their efforts to spread democracy now. Arms sales are key.

B) US support for democracy is critical to challenge the spread of authoritarianism. Democracy is key to global stability.

C) IMPACT - Democracy is key to solve warming. This turns the case.

## 2NC/1NR – Extension – HARMS - Relations

### Frontline #2: No Solvency - Warming

1. Extend our Davenport & Landler 2019 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

It's better than their Bapna 2018 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_

2. Trump makes climate change worse.

## 2NC/1NR – Ext – HARMS - Relations Frontline

### #3: Democracy Turn

1. Extend the democracy turn: Our Ing-Wen 2018 evidence indicates that right now \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ And our Abrams 2016 evidence indicates that decline of US support for democracy

**results**

**in** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **This turns the case because our  
Looney 2016 evidence  
says** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**2. They say, “Trump erodes global democracy”, but  
America is still a strong liberal democracy despite  
Trump – Five reasons.**

**3. They say “democracy promotion fails,” but US  
support for democracy is critical to counteract  
democratic decline.**

**4. They say that China proves Democracy is not key,  
but China’s emissions are increasing.**

## **Elections Disadvantage v. Taiwan**

### **1NC Elections Disadvantage Shell vs. Taiwan**

**A. UNIQUENESS: Democrats are on track to win in  
2020, but it’s not a guarantee.**

**B. LINK: Plan makes Democrats look weak on China.  
That’s a losing strategy for 2020.**

**C. IMPACT: Re-electing Trump causes extinction  
because of global warming.**

### **2nc/1nr – Link – Taiwan**

**The regular arms sales process means Congress gets  
blamed, not Trump, through normal means  
GOP are extremely loyal to Trump and Dems vote  
against him. This means that it’s the Democrats who  
kill Taiwan arms sales.**

**Americans want greater engagement with allies –  
abandoning Taiwan does the opposite.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #1 – Approval Ratings**

#### **Don’t Matter**

**Trump is super unpopular. That means he’s likely to  
lose.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #2 – Non-unique**

**Democrats are likely to win due to demographic changes, but turn out is key.**

**Trump is likely to lose tons of voters.**

**Trump would lose if the election was held today.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #3 – no internal link**

**Even if Democrats don't win the Senate, a new Democrat President can put us back in Paris climate accord.**

**Withdrawal from Paris climate accord wrecks global efforts to address climate change.**

## **Alliances Disadvantage vs. Taiwan**

### **1NC Alliances Disadvantage Shell vs. Taiwan**

**A. Uniqueness - US-Japan alliance is stronger than ever, but it can be disrupted.**

**B. LINK - Abandoning Taiwan sends a signal to Japan that it can't depend on America.**

**C. INTERNAL LINK - Japan will pursue nuclear weapons if it doubts the alliance.**

**D. IMPACT: Japan nuclearization escalates to all out war.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #1 – No Link**

**Abandoning Taiwan erodes credibility of US East Asia policy and kills alliances.**

**Japan is uniquely concerned about Taiwan now.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #2 – No link**

**Abandoning Taiwan through the plan hurts Japanese security – that wrecks the alliance.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #3 – No internal link**

**Japan's Prime Minister has weakened Civilian Control of the military. That distinguishes today from past conversations about nuclearization.**

**Japan's Prime Minister won't sign prohibition treaty, which means Japan will still pursue nukes if it has to.**

## **1NC Topicality Shell vs. Taiwan**

### **1NC Topicality vs. Taiwan**

**A. Interpretation: The US must reduce arms sales by at least \$3.846 billion.**

**1. "Substantial" must be at least 2%**

**2. Foreign military sales and direct commercial sales totaled \$192.3 billion.**

**B. Violation: Taiwan arms sales only amount to \$129 million**

**C. Standards:**

- 1. Limits – a quantitative standard for substantial is an objective bright line. This is key because the US supplies arms to over 98 countries. Without an objective limit the negative cannot properly prepare for all the country specific affirmatives.**
  - 2. Ground – a percentage reduction is key to ensure that the negative can link core topic generic arguments like the Alliances DA, Defense Industrial Base DA, and the elections DA. If the reduction is too small, then the negative loses out on disadvantages.**
- D. Topicality is a voter for fairness and education.**

## **2NC/1NR Block for Topicality vs. Taiwan**

### **2NC/1NR Block for Topicality-Substantial vs. Taiwan**

**A. Extend our interpretation – The US must reduce arm sales by \$3.846 billion.**

**B. Extend our definition - Substantial is 2%, according to Words and Phrases 1960. You should prefer our evidence to their Words and Phrases 2002 evidence because**

---

**Extend our Macdonald 2018 evidence - it says that the US foreign military sales and direct commercial sales of arms totaled \$192.3 billion.**

**C. Extend our violation – the plan does not reduce arms sales by at least \$3.846 billion because US arms sales to Ukraine were on \$47 million in 2018. That’s way less than \$3.846 billion.**

***On to the standards –***

- 1. Extend our limits argument – only a numerical limit such as our interpretation can set an objective standard to determine which affirmatives are topical. They say that we over limit – even if we over limit, over limiting is better than under limiting because it’s fairer to the negative. The affirmative gets to choose**

**the specific topic of discussion and a more limited topic protects neg preparation.**

**2. Extend our ground argument – a sizable percentage reduction is key to neg links to core topic generic arguments such as the alliance DA or the Elections DA. That’s key to competitive equity. They say that our interpretation eliminates all country specific affs – even if that’s true for smaller countries, the aff can defend reducing significant arms sales to Saudi Arabia, which would be Topical and educational to debate**

**3. Topicality is a voter for fairness and education. You should default to competing interpretations:**

**a. it’s the best way to prevent judges from intervening based on their own opinion of what should be debated.**

**b. There’s no clear standard for what is reasonably topical.**

*On to their side of the flow –*

**1. Their interpretation provides no limit on the topic – they offer no way to determine what counts as having real worth or considerable value.**

**2. They say their interpretation is better for ground – country specific affirmatives are impossible for the neg to engage specifically. We sell arms to 97 countries. This means that we need to prepare 97 case negs under their topic. That’s impossible.**

## **1NC Consult NATO CP vs. Taiwan**

**COUNTERPLAN TEXT: The United States federal government should enter into a prior binding consultation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) about whether it should**

**end its arms sales to Taiwan and  
abide by NATO's decision.**



Taiwan Case Negative—Chicago Debates High School Core Files 2019-2020

**A. Trump does not consult NATO about foreign policy decisions and takes unilateral action.**

**B. Consultation through NATO is key to developing a common strategic purpose.**

**C. Common NATO strategy is key to deter terrorism.**

**D. IMPACT: 1) Terrorism will go nuclear – it can happen.**

**2) Nuclear terrorism sparks retaliatory escalation that results in nuclear war.**

**E. SOLVENCY - NATO says yes – its biggest concern is a crisis in Asia that draws the US away from Europe.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #1 – NATO Says NO**

**NATO opposes actions that increase tensions in the South China Seas – it says yes to the plan.**

**The former head of NATO says that NATO’s goal is to focus on Europe, not the globe.**

**Even if NATO says no, you should weigh the impact of the Consult Counterplan vs the impact of the case. Our net benefit of NATO cohesion outweighs their case because \_\_\_\_\_**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #2 – NATO Bad Turn**

**Perception of weakened commitment by the US to NATO increases the risk of miscalculation and causes war with Russia. The Counterplan solves the turn.**

**A strong NATO is a force multiplier that stops Russian aggression, strengthens the economy, and is key to tackle multiple threats.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #3 – Deterrence Fails**

**We can deter terrorists.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC – Permutation: Do Both**

**1. Mutual exclusivity – the Plan is a unilateral action, while the counterplan is multilateral. You can’t do both at the same time.**

**2. Certainty – the Plan is certain, while the counter plan is uncertain—reducing arms sales only happens if NATO says yes. This means that you can’t do both because going ahead with the plan no matter what defeats the purpose of consultation.**

## **Saudi Arabia Case Negative**

## **HARMS - Yemen Crisis Answers**

### **1NC – HARMS - Yemen Crisis**

1. Ending arms sales doesn't solve – Russia and China just fill in.
2. Support Good - Ending US support for Saudi Arabia will make the conflict worse.

### **2NC /1NR HARMS - Yemen Crisis – Fill In**

Russia and China fill in is empirically proven when the US doesn't sell weapons.

### **2NC /1NR HARMS - Yemen Crisis –Pressure**

#### **Turn**

Even if they win that ending arms sales results in Saudi Arabia ending its participation in the Yemen conflict, that won't solve the conflict.

## **HARMS - Reform Answers**

### **1NC HARMS - Reform**

1. Reforms are empirically proven to fail – Saudi Arabia just cracks down in new ways.

**2. No pressure – ending arms sales is specifically ineffective when attempting to alter a state’s domestic policy.**

**3. Oil prices turn –**

**A) Banning arms sales causes the Saudis to lash out by crushing oil supply. That causes a price spike.**

**B) Oil price spikes cause a recession – empirically proven.**

C) Economic downturn causes Trump to wage diversionary war.

**2NC/1NR – EXT – 1NC HARMS - Reform**

**Frontline #1 – Reform fails**

1. Extend our 1NC Allam 2019 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_
2. It's better than their Al-Rasheed 2018 evidence because \_\_\_\_\_
3. Prince Bin Salman coopts women's rights reform to consolidate power and push his totalitarian agenda without materially improving women's status. Reform is impossible.

**2NC /1NR EXT – 1NC HARMS - Reform**

**Frontline #2 – No pressure**

1. Extend Our Rounds 2019 evidence that says  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. No pressure – Saudi Arabia is moving towards diversification.

**2NC /1NR – EXT – 2NC HARMS - Reform #3 - Oil Prices Turn**

They say “high oil prices fuel renewable energy,” but low oil prices discourage drilling and fuel investment in green tech.

Low oil prices drive up natural gas prices, which directly affects electricity prices, increasing renewable usage.

**FRAMING – Utilitarianism Good**

**1NC – Utilitarianism Good**

- 1) If you are uncertain what moral system is best, always prioritize preventing extinction.
- 2) All ethical systems collapse into utilitarian calculations at some point.

**Elections Disadvantage vs. Saudi Arabia**

### **1NC Elections Disadvantage Shell (vs. Saudi Arabia)**

- A. **UNIQUENESS: Democrats are on track to win in 2020, but it's not a guarantee.**
- B. **LINK: Trump's pro-Saudi approach helps Democrats win in 2020. The plan reverses his policy.**
- C. **IMPACT: Re-electing Trump causes extinction because of warming.**

### **2NC / 1NR – Link Wall – Saudi Arabia**

Plan's a win for Trump – ending arms sales is popular. Saudi Arabia is very unpopular. American public sentiment is against Saudi Arabia

### **2NC /1NR – Answers to 2AC #1 – Polls Fail**

Polling methods have adjusted since 2016 and midterms prove efficacy.

### **2NC /1NR – Answers to 2AC – Trump's Foreign Policy Popular**

Voters feel like Trump's foreign policy is a reason to elect someone else, especially undecided and swing voters.

### **2NC /1NR – Answers to 2AC #2 – No link Threshold**

Foreign Policy is uniquely key to the 2020 election. It's a weakness for Trump. Even if Foreign Policy is not the most important issue, the election will be decided by small shifts.

### **2NC /1NR – Answers to 2AC #3 – No Internal Link**

Even if Dems don't win the Senate, a new Democrat President can put us back in the Paris climate accord. Withdrawal from Paris climate accord wrecks global efforts to address climate change.

## **Alliances Disadvantage vs. Saudi Arabia**

### **1NC Alliances Disadvantage Shell (against Saudi Arabia)**

- A. **Uniqueness - US-Japan alliance is stronger than ever, but it can be disrupted.**

**B. LINK: Japan views US treatment of Middle East allies as a signal of commitment. Plan sends the wrong message.**

**C. INTERNAL LINK: Japan will pursue nuclear weapons if it doubts the alliance.**

**D. IMPACT: Japan nuclearization escalates to all out war.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #1 – Credibility**

#### **Theory False**

1. Extend our Sachs 2016 evidence - it says \_\_\_\_\_

2. US credibility does matter

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #2 – Link threshold**

Constant reassurances are key to maintain Japan alliance.

Now is key because Trump has expressed doubts about the alliance.

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC # 3 – no great power**

#### **war**

The world is moving towards great power war – only the US can prevent it.



Deterrence is breaking down now.

## **1NC Topicality Shell vs. Saudi Arabia**

### **1NC Topicality (vs. Saudi Arabia Affirmative)**

A. Interpretation: The US must reduce arms sales by at least \$3.846 billion.

1. “Substantial” must be at least 2%
2. Foreign military sales and direct commercial sales totaled \$192.3 billion.

B. Violation: US arms sales to Saudi Arabia totaled only \$3.35 billion.

C. Standards –

1. Limits – a quantitative standard for substantial is an objective bright line. This is key because the US supplies arms to over 98 countries. Without an objective limit the negative cannot properly prepare for all the country specific affirmatives.
2. Ground – a percentage reduction is key to ensure that the negative can link core topic generic arguments like the Alliances DA, Defense Industrial Base DA, and the elections DA. If the reduction is too small, then the negative loses out on disadvantages.

D. Topicality is a voter for fairness and education.

## **2NC/1NR Block for Topicality vs. Saudi Arabia**

### **2NC/1NR Block for Topicality-Substantial (vs. Saudi Arabia)**

A. Extend our interpretation – The US must reduce arm sales by \$3.846 billion.

B. Extend our definition. Substantial is 2%, that’s according to Words and Phrases 1960. You should prefer our evidence to their Words and phrases 2002 evidence because

---

Extend our Macdonald 2018 evidence - it says that the US foreign military sales and direct commercial sales of arms totaled \$192.3 billion.

**C. Extend our violation – the plan does not reduce arms sales by at least \$3.846 billion because US arms sales to Saudia Arabia were \$3.35 billion in 2018. That’s less than \$3.846 billion.**

*On to the standards –*

**1. Extend our limits argument – only a numerical limit such as our interpretation can set an objective standard to determine which affirmatives are topical. They say that we over limit – even if we over limit, over limiting is better than under limiting because it’s fairer to the negative. The affirmative gets to choose the specific topic of discussion and a more limited topic protects neg preparation.**

**2. Extend our ground argument – a sizable percentage reduction is key to neg links to core topic generic arguments such as the alliance DA or the Elections DA. That’s key to competitive equity. They say that our interpretation eliminates all country specific affs – even if that’s true for smaller countries, the aff can defend reducing significant arms sales to UAE, small arms sales, and regional arms sales, which would be Topical and educational to debate**

**3. Topicality is a voter for fairness and education. You should default to competing interpretations:**

**a. it’s the best way to prevent judges from intervening based on their own opinion of what should be debated.**

**b. There’s no clear standard for what is reasonably topical.**

*On to their side of the flow –*

**1. Their interpretation provides no limit on the topic – they offer no way to determine what counts as having real worth or considerable value.**

**2. They say their interpretation is better for ground – country specific affirmatives are impossible for the neg to engage specifically. We sell arms to 97 countries. This means that we need to prepare 97 case negs under their topic. That’s impossible.**

## **1NC Consult NATO Counterplan vs. Saudi Arabia**

**COUNTERPLAN TEXT: The United States federal government should enter into a prior binding consultation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) about whether it should institute an embargo on arms sales to Saudi Arabia and abide by NATO's decision.**

- A. Trump does not consult NATO about foreign policy decisions and takes unilateral action.**
- B. Consultation through NATO is key to developing a common strategic purpose.**

**C. Common NATO strategy is key to deter terrorism.**

**D. IMPACT: 1. Terrorism will go nuclear – it can happen.**

**2) Nuclear terrorism sparks retaliatory escalation that results in nuclear war.**

**E. SOLVENCY - NATO is looking to US for what to do on Saudi Arabia – it says yes to the Counterplan.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #1 – NATO says No**

**Their evidence doesn't take into account a UK court's ruling that Saudi arms sales are illegal, which changes the UK's stance.**

**Seeking an embargo sends a signal to US allies and allows for them to follow – NATO says yes.**

**There's also pressure from Turkey, which helps push for a NATO yes.**

**Germany is pressuring allies now to end arms sales – this helps secure a NATO yes.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #2 – NATO Bad**

**NATO does not cause wars – it's a deterrent force for peace.**

**Even if NATO has had problems in the past, perception of declining commitment now fuels miscalculation and causes conflict. The Counterplan is key.**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC Frontline #3 – Permutation: Do Both**

**1. Mutual exclusivity – the Plan is a unilateral action, while the counterplan is multilateral. You can't do both at the same time.**

**2. Certainty – the Plan is certain, while the counterplan is uncertain—reducing arms sales only happens if NATO says yes. This means that you can't do both because going ahead with the plan no matter what defeats the purpose of consultation.**

# **Feminist International Relations Kritik (Advanced – Varsity)**

## **1NC Kritik Shells**

### **1NC Fem IR Kritik Shell vs. Ukraine**

- A. LINK:** Reliance on the State as a protector re-entrenches masculinity because the State can use dominance as an excuse to glaze over issues that are not considered “security crises”
- B. IMPACT:** The impact is extinction – patriarchy makes warfare, militarism, and environmental destruction inevitable.
- C. ALTERNATIVE:** The alternative is to engage in critical feminist scholarship that rejects the militarism embedded in the affirmative. Analysis of our everyday world, such as this debate round, is key to reshaping scholarship.

### **1NC Fem IR Kritik Shell vs. Taiwan**

- A. LINK:** The 1AC’s attempt at global crisis management through adjusting weapons is rooted in patriarchal thinking.
- B. IMPACT:** The impact is extinction – patriarchy makes warfare, militarism, and environmental destruction inevitable.
- C. ALTERNATIVE:** The alternative is to engage in critical feminist scholarship that rejects the militarism embedded in the aff. Analysis of our everyday world, such as this debate round, is key to reshaping scholarship.

### **1NC Fem IR Kritik Shell vs. Saudi Arabia**

- A. LINK:** The 1AC claims to be a move towards responsible weapons policy. But that’s a oxymoron that masks white masculine imperialism.
- B. IMPACT:** The impact is extinction – patriarchy makes warfare, militarism, and environmental destruction inevitable.
- C. ALTERNATIVE:** The alternative is to engage in critical feminist scholarship that rejects the militarism embedded in the aff. Analysis of our everyday world, such as this debate round, is key to reshaping scholarship.

## **2NC/1NR Kritik Extensions**

### **2NC/1NR Answers to – Engaging the state good**

**1. State feminism is bad – it is used to mask anti-feminist policies and forces compliance with the state through force.**

**2NC/1NR Answers to– Alternative fails**

**Traditional modes of policy debate demand taking the perspective of the United States. This exclusive perspective renders scholarship produced within this model unethical and incorrect. A feminist methodology disrupts these power relations and norm making. Our methodology of critique is good. It opens up new possibilities.**

**2NC Kritik Link for Taiwan**

**1. Extend our Vucetic 2018 evidence – it says \_\_\_\_\_**

---

---

---

---

**The affirmative links to this because in the 1AC, they said \_\_\_\_\_**

---

---

**2. Their big stick impacts link – the 1AC’s utilization of war fantasies to justify the plan by appealing to the dangers of the world locks in masculine forms of domination. Specifically, the invocation of nuclear war between the US and China is a link.**

**2NC – Kritik Link vs. Saudi Arabia**

**1. Extend our Vucetic 2018 evidence – it says \_\_\_\_\_**

---

---

---

---

**The affirmative links to this because in the 1AC, they said \_\_\_\_\_**

---

---

**2. Human rights link – the aff claims the plan is a good idea because of human rights. This serves to legitimize militarism.**

**3. They say that the plan is in the direction of the Kritik, but they still link because**

---

---

---

---

---

---

## **AFF Answers to Fem IR Kritik**

### **2AC Feminist International Relations K Frontline**

**1. Link turn – the affirmative is in the direction of the Kritik. Only by creating changes in state arms sale policy can we solve global violence.**

**1. The Kritik links to the status quo more than the plan. That means that you should vote aff because it's still preferable to the status quo.**

**3. Engaging the state is good – Feminist activists' protests pressured Sweden to end its arms sales to Saudi Arabia.**

**4. Their Alternative fails - They don't have a pragmatic strategy – inaction causes paralysis**

**5. Permutation: do both – we can do a policy action and engage in scholarship about feminist international relations.**

### **1AR Extensions to 2AC #1 – Link turn**

**Link turn - The plan is a form of feminist foreign policy – that means we make the world better.**

### **1AR – Engaging the state is good**

**Problems with status quo feminist foreign policy are a reason to engage the state to improve policy**

### **1AR – Alt Fails**

**The abstraction and critique of the alternative fail to produce change.**

### **1AR EXTENSIONS TO 2AC #4 – Permutation: do both**

**Extend permutation: do both from the 2AC.**

**1. The Kritik is not competitive – you can do the scholarship of the Kritik and pass the plan. This combines the pragmatic strategy of the plan with the scholarship of the Kritik.**



2. Extend the Saloom 2006 evidence – having a concrete starting point is key to action. Only the permutation gives people a pragmatic starting point for applying the kritik’s scholarship. This is the best approach.
3. They say the permutation will be co-opted, but the permutation doesn’t force them to forgo their scholarship or attempt to hijack it. Rather, it’s a form of coalition building that emphasizes an “and/both” approach instead of an “either/or” approach.

## **K Framework (Varsity Only)**

### **NEG Kritik Framework**

#### **Framework**

**Interpretation:** The judge should evaluate the assumptions of the plan first. The aff must be responsible for the plan *and* its assumptions.

**Reasons to prefer:**

1. Fiat is not real – voting affirmative won’t change US policy. Thus, you should prioritize feminist theorizing that imagines new worlds.
2. Role playing is bad -
  - A. Our acceptance of roles promotes self deception and leads to an unwavering faith in the good of our actions. Challenging our thought processes is key.
  - B. Impact – self-deception is a prerequisite to genocide. We must reject role-playing in favor of questioning our assumptions.
3. Desirability – it is impossible to assess whether or not the plan is a good idea without looking at their assumptions. Policy making is constrained by our mindset. Evaluating assumptions is a necessary first step.

### **AFF Kritik Framework**

#### **2AC - Aff – Policymaking Good Framework**

**Interpretation:** The judge should evaluate the hypothetical implementation of the plan versus a competitive policy option.

**Reasons to prefer:**

- 1. Fairness – their interpretation moots the 1AC, which kills fairness because we should be able to weigh our case.**
- 2. Political change – the infinite demands of the alternative allow for the state to circumvent accountability. Only specific, limited demands lead to material change.**
- 3. Their framework cedes the political – A) we're on the brink of Trump led right wing takeover. But resistance is possible.  
B) The alternative cedes the political, which results in right wing takeover and massive violence.**

### **1AR – AFF Framework extension**

**Extend our interpretation: The judge should evaluate the hypothetical implementation of the plan versus a competitive policy option.**

**Reasons to prefer –**

## **Glossary**