

Table of Contents
2019-2020 CMSDL Middle School
Argument Limits
2019-2020 CMSDL Middle School
Argument Limits
2019-2020 CMSDL Middle School
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 is Harms – Ukraine Crisis

Trump is currently committed to increasing arms sales to Ukraine.

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 2 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 Varsity/JV)* 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. Arming Ukraine fails to deter Russia and results in entanglement which forces US escalation.

3. 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.

1AR – Answers to Ukraine Crisis Harms Frontline

#1: Arms sales good turn

1. Extend our 2AC Cohen 2015 evidence, which says _____

Our evidence is better than their evidence because _____

2. Extend our 1AC Carpenter 2018 evidence - it says _____

–
3 Extend our 2AC Menon and Ruger 2017 evidence – it says _____

Our evidence is better than their evidence because _____

4. 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 2AC Tisdall 2018 evidence - it says _____

It's better than their evidence because _____

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

3. Extend our 2AC Larson 2012 evidence - it says _____

It's better than their evidence because _____

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

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.

1AR - Answers to Solvency Frontline

1. Extend our 2AC DePetris 2018 evidence - it says _____

Our evidence is better than their evidence because _____

2. We Solve - Russia wants to improve relations and Ukraine is key.

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 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 evidence because _____

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

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

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

1. Extend our 1AC Foy & Shephard 2019 evidence - it says _____

2. Extend our 2AC Chausovsky 2019 evidence - it says _____

It's better than their 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 2AC Long 2018 evidence - it says _____

It's better than their 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 - Voters don’t care about foreign policy.**

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

1. **Extend our 2AC Olsen 2019 evidence - it says**

Our Olsen 2019 evidence is better than their evidence because _____

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

1AR – EXTENSIONS 2AC #2 - No link

1. **Extend our 2AC Emerson Polling 2019 evidence - it says _____**

Our Emerson Polling 2019 evidence is better than their evidence because

2. **Trump is vulnerable on health care, not foreign policy**
- 3 **Health care is the top issue in 2020.**
- 4 **We win the disadvantage debate because _____**

2AC- Frontline: Answers to Alliances Disadvantage

1. **No link – arms sales are different from alliance commitments.**
2. **No impact – Japan won’t pursue nuclear weapons. Past predictions have been wrong.**

1AR – EXTENSION – 2AC Alliance Disadvantage Frontline #1 – No Link

1. **Extend our 2AC 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.**

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 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 – it wants to improve Ukraine's defense capabilities.

2. Consultation doesn't solve - NATO's problems are too deep and consultation on the plan won't fix them.

5. 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 2AC Al-Jazeera 2019 evidence - it says

Our Al Jazeera 2019 evidence is better than their 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 Walt 2018 evidence - it says

Our Walt 2018 evidence is better than their evidence because _____

2. Consultation doesn’t solve - Democratic backsliding within NATO is the real issue that fuels disunity. Katz & Taussig 2018

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 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 goes nuclear and normal checks don't apply. Changing US foreign policy is key.

Contention 2 is Solvency

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

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

(Additional JV/Varsity) Harms – Relations

Declining relations stops cooperation on climate change.

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

2AC/1AR Taiwan Affirmative

2AC HARMS (Taiwan Crisis)

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 deescalating tensions through the plan solves.

2AC - Answers to 1NC Taiwan Crisis #2 – Taiwan

Proliferation

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

1AR Answers to 1NC Taiwan Crisis #1 –

Appeasement – Containment Turn

Extend our 2AC 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.

2AC Solvency

2AC Answers to Solvency – “Trade War Now”

They say there’s a trade war now, but...

Extend our 1AC Glaser 2011 evidence. Ending arms sales to Taiwan solves the entire China relationship and is the one thing they care about most because

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

2AC/1AR Harms – Relations (optional JV/Varsity Harms)

2AC - Answers to Relations Frontline #1: Can't Solve Warming

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

2AC – Answers to HARMS – Relations #2 “No Warming Solvency – China”

China is the global leader on meeting climate targets.

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

1. Extend our 2AC Bapna 2018 evidence - it says _____
It's better than their evidence
because _____
2. China-US cooperation is still possible through green tech companies, but tensions derail technology adoption and investment.
3. We win the Harms debate
because _____

1AR Answers to Relations Frontline #2 – “No Warming Solvency – China”

1. Extend our 2AC Ye 2018 evidence - it says _____
It's better than their evidence
because _____
2. China can implement top down policies to address warming.
3. It's try or die to solve warming – the next 12 years are key
4. We win the Harms debate
because _____

Taiwan 2AC/1AR Answers to Off Case

2AC Frontline: Answers to Elections Disadvantage

1. **NON-UNIQUE: Trump will win now - Even if Trump’s approval ratings are low, their consistency shows the strength of his base.**
2. **No internal link - Democrats will lose the Senate. That means their agenda is a nonstarter.**

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

1. **Extend our 2AC Vittert & Lind 2019 evidence - it says**

Our Vittert & Lind 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 #2 – No internal link

1. **Extend our 2AC Golshan & Nielsen 2019 evidence - it says** _____

Our Golshan & Nielsen 2019 evidence is better than their 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 impact – Japan won’t pursue nuclear weapons. Past predictions have been wrong.**

1AR EXTENSIONS TO #1 – No Link

1. **Extend our 2AC 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 Internal Link

1. Extend our 2AC 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. 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. 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 2AC 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 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. 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

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.

Contention 2 - Harms: Reform

Ending arms sales pressures Saudi Arabia to improve human rights

Increasing pressure now is key to end the guardianship system.

Saudi Arabia AFFIRMATIVE (Advanced - Varsity) —Lake Michigan Conference

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

2AC/1AR Saudi Arabia Affirmative

2AC 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.

That solves bombings and blockades – that’s the major cause of mass suffering.

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

1. Extend our 2AC 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

Ending US support is good – it causes Saudi withdrawal. 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 – ending arms sales fails

1. Extend our 1AC Caverly 2018 evidence – ending arms sales pressures Saudi Arabia. This creates change because our 1AC 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.

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

1. Extend our 2AC Al-Rasheed 2018 evidence - it says _____

–
It’s better than their evidence because _____

5 Their evidence ignores how status quo US foreign policy shields Saudi royal family 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 empirically proven.

Saudi Arabia 2AC/1AR Answers to Off Case

2AC – Front Line: Answers to Elections

Disadvantage

- 1. No link uniqueness and no link – Trump is already winning on foreign policy.
- 2. No link - Voters don’t care about foreign policy.
- 3. No Internal link - If Democrats don’t win the Senate, then they can’t solve warming.

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

1. Extend our 2AC Ward 2019 evidence - it says

Our Ward 2019 evidence is better than their 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 2AC Hunt 2019 evidence - it says

Our Hunt 2019 evidence is better than their evidence because

2 No impact to rejoining Paris agreement - 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 impact – Japan won't pursue nuclear weapons. Past predictions have been wrong.

1AR EXTENSIONS TO #1 – Credibility Theory Wrong

1. Extend our 2AC Walt 2012 evidence - it says

Our Walt 2012 evidence is better than their evidence because

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

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 aff such as the conditions CP or Consult CP. These provide a functional limit on the topic.

B) Education – our interpretation allows debates on aff’s 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 affs – 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 is Bad- NATO justifies imperialistic wars**
- 3. 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 2AC Economist 2019 evidence - it says**

Our Economist 2019 evidence is better than their evidence because

2. Disagreement over Saudi arms sales mean that the CP 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 2AC Flowers & Zeese 2019 evidence says

Prefer our evidence to their 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 #3

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 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.

Ukraine Case Negative

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

1. TURN: Arms sales are good – Their evidence says the US is going to expand arms sales to Ukraine. We need to continue selling arms because Russia’s President Putin will invade other countries and go to war – Ukraine arms sales are key to stop him.

2. TURN: US support for Ukraine through arms sales demonstrates support for democracy.

1NC Answers to Solvency

No solvency – US sanctions on Russia make any improvement in relations impossible

1NC Answers to (Optional Varsity/JV) Harms - 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.

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 _____

–
This turns the case because _____

- 2. They say that arms sales provoke Russia, but our Bloomberg 2018 evidence says _____

3 Russia is testing the US in Ukraine. A weak response now greenlights aggression.

4 Arms sales are key to deter the aggression of Russia.

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

#2- Democracy Turn

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

This turns the case because _____

2. They say Trump ruins democracy, but commitment to Ukraine shows support for democracy.

3. 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 1NC 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 1NC Borgerson 2013 evidence - it says_____

—
Our Borgerson 2013 evidence is better than their 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 1NC Meredith & Turak 2019 evidence_____

—
Our evidence is better than their 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 warming.

2NC or 1NR Answers to Non-unique

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

The most accurate models predict Trump will lose now.

2NC or 1NR Link Extension

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. IMPACT: Japan will pursue nuclear weapons if it doubts the alliance.

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/1NR Answers to 2AC #2 – No impact

Japan's Prime Minister wants nuclear weapons
Japan nuclearization escalates to all out war.

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 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.

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 —Lake Michigan Conference

- 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. IMPACT: A common NATO strategy is key to deter terrorism.

D. SOLVENCY: NATO says yes to the plan – 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

1. Extend our 1NC King 2015 evidence. Consultation is key to NATO cohesion. It's better than their evidence because

2. Consultation solves cohesion.

3. Extend our 1NC Cordesman 2018 evidence. NATO is key to deter terrorism. It's better than their evidence because

4. Terrorism will go nuclear – it can happen.

5. Nuclear terrorism sparks retaliatory escalation that results in nuclear war.

6. Trump's lack of faith in NATO is its biggest problem. It won't change in the status quo absent the counterplan.

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 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.

Taiwan Case Negative

HARMS - Taiwan Crisis Answers

1NC HARMS – Taiwan Crisis Frontline

1. Appeasement turn - The plan is accommodation that emboldens Chinese aggression.
2. 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

Appeasement results in Chinese invasion of Taiwan. Pressure on Xi from his own party means that perception of US weakness causes Chinese invasion of Taiwan.

2nc/1nr HARMS – # 2 – Taiwan prolif

Nuclear proliferation in Asia risks nuclear war

Solvency ANSWERS

1NC SOLVENCY Answers

1. The ongoing trade war with China wrecks relations – plan can't solve.

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

1. Extend our 1NC Lee 2019 evidence – it says _____
–
2. It's better than their evidence because _____
3. 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. China is all talk when it comes to climate change - China's emissions are increasing.

2NC/1NR – Extension – HARMS - Relations

Frontline #1: No Solvency - Warming

1. Extend our Davenport & Landler 2019 evidence - it says _____
It's better than their evidence because _____
2. Trump makes climate change worse.

2NC/1NR – Extension – HARMS - Relations

Frontline #2: No Solvency - China

1. Extend our Wescott 2019 evidence - it says _____
It's better than their evidence because _____
2. No impact – we're past the tipping point and global warming is locked in.

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 warming.

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

“Trump will win”

- Trump is likely to lose tons of voters.
Trump would lose if the election was held today.

2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #2 – 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. **IMPACT - Japan will pursue nuclear weapons if it doubts the alliance.**

2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #1 – No Link

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

Japan is uniquely concerned about Taiwan now.

2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #2 – No impact

Japan's Prime Minister wants nuclear weapons
Japan nuclearization escalates to all out war.

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 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 —Lake Michigan Conference

- 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. IMPACT: Common NATO strategy is key to deter terrorism.

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.

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

7. Extend our 1NC Cordesman 2018 evidence. NATO is key to deter terrorism. It’s better than their evidence because _____

8. Terrorism will go nuclear – it can happen.

9. Nuclear terrorism sparks retaliatory escalation that results in nuclear war.

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

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.

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

#1

1. Extend our 1NC Allam 2019 evidence - it says_____

It's better than their evidence because_____

2. Prince Bin Salman co-opts 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 1NC Rounds 2019 evidence - it says_____

It's better than their evidence because_____

2. No pressure – Saudi Arabia is moving towards diversification.

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 – 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 – Voters don't care

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 – GOP Senate

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. IMPACT: Japan will pursue nuclear weapons if it doubts the alliance.

2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #1 – Credibility Theory False

1. Extend our 1NC Sachs 2016 evidence - it says _____

2. US credibility does matter

2NC/1NR Answers to 2AC #2 – No impact

Japan's Prime Minister wants nuclear weapons
Japan can obtain nuclear weapons in six months.
Japan nuclearization escalates to all-out war.

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 Ukraine were on \$47 million in 2018. That's way less then \$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 Taiwan, 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.

Saudi Arabia Case Negative —Lake Michigan Conference

- 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. IMPACT: Common NATO strategy is key to deter terrorism.

D. 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

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.

German pressuring allies now to end arms sales – this helps secure a NATO yes.

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

11. Extend our 1NC Cordesman 2018 evidence. NATO is key to deter terrorism. It's better than their evidence because

12. Terrorism will go nuclear – it can happen.

13. Nuclear terrorism sparks retaliatory escalation that results in nuclear war.

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

15. 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 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.

Glossary