

Table of Contents

1. Introduction to 2019-2020 Core Files.....	2
2. Debate Basics/Conceptual Primers.....	3
3. Core Files Vocabulary.....	13
4. Argument Primers.....	14
a. Ukraine	
b. Taiwan	
c. Saudi Arabia	
d. Disadvantages	
e. Consult NATO Counterplan	
f. Feminist International Relations Kritik	
5. How-Tos	
a. Highlighting and Annotating (ex. Ukraine aff).....	17
b. Flowing Shorthand Codes.....	19
c. How to Create Mini-Debates.....	20
6. Graphic Organizers	
a. Evidence Pulling for Affs and Case Neg.....	21
b. Writing Rebuttals.....	34
c. Mapping Out Disadvantages.....	38
d. Answering Topicality as 2AC.....	39
e. Generic Topicality Templates.....	40
7. Activities/Games	
a. CX Drills.....	43
b. Sample Case CX Questions (Ukraine).....	46
c. Sample Disadvantage CX Questions.....	47
d. Evidence Comparison.....	48
e. Mini Debate Directions.....	49
f. Ukraine (Ukraine Crisis) Mini Debate.....	50
g. Topicality Mini Debate.....	66
h. Example Flow from Ukraine Case Debate.....	71

Introduction to 2019-2020 Core Files

HS Policy Debate Resolution for SY 19-20:

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce Direct Commercial Sales and/or Foreign Military Sales of arms from the United States.

This year's Core Files contain 3 affirmatives, and their negative case responses, 2 disadvantages, 3 topicality arguments, 1 counterplan, and 1 kritik. This year, we have 1 affirmative, Ukraine, in two different versions: v.1 a more rookie/novice friendly version and v.2 a more accelerated junior varsity/varsity level option.

Argument	2019-2020 Versions
Affirmatives	Ukraine, Taiwan, Saudi Arabia
Disadvantages	Elections, Alliance
Topicality	Substantial
Counterplan	Consult NATO
Kritik	Feminist International Relations

This year's disadvantages are the CDL's versions of popular camp ones. You'll probably see variations of alliances this year, as well as lots of elections DAs. This year's counterplan is a variation of the traditional consult Counterplan.

We recommend novice debaters starting with the Ukraine affirmative. The disadvantages should all be novice friendly, with Alliances being a good entry level DA which is a good access point for students.

For more information on the arguments, please see the "Argument Primers" section of this manual.

Debate Basics/Conceptual Primers

A. *What is a CASE?*

A **CASE** is a set of arguments that explains why something is either good or bad. In policy debate, we usually focusing on showing why a particular plan is a good idea. The **AFFIRMATIVE (AFF)** side of the debate presents the case in the very first speech. For example, imagine a teenager had a curfew and wanted their parents to let them stay out later. They might present a case that supports their Plan of having a later curfew

Right now, my curfew is 10 pm. That early curfew is causing me some problems. First, there are a lot of social activities that end later, and my curfew means I can't go. It's hard to keep friends when I can't spend time with them. Secondly, there is a job I'm interested in applying for, but it requires working until 11 pm some nights. I could really use the money to help save for college, but I can't take the job with my current curfew. So I think my curfew should be pushed back to 12 am. That will let me spend more time with my friends, and allow me to take this job.

This set of arguments does everything a basic case should do. The case needs to present a **PLAN**, which is statement about what they want to do. The case needs a plan, because if the aff doesn't do anything, there's no reason to prefer the aff to the way things are right now. In this example, the plan is to make the curfew 12 am.

The case should also show that the plan is not happening right now. That's important because why would we waste time doing something we have already done? In debate, we call arguments about whether the plan is already happening **INHERENCY** arguments. In the example, the aff demonstrates Inherency by pointing out that the current curfew is earlier than it would be under their plan.

The third thing a case needs to do is show that there is some problem that is happening right now. If there isn't a problem, then there is no need to change anything, and the aff will lose the debate. In debate, we call arguments about these problems **HARMS** arguments. In this example, the aff shows harms in two ways. The first is by arguing that the early curfew makes it hard to make friends. The second is by arguing that they miss out on money they could earn by working later. The last thing the case needs to do is show how the plan will fix the harms. That's important because if the plan doesn't work, then there is no reason to do it. Arguments about whether the plan will work or not are called **SOLVENCY** arguments. In this case, the plan solves because it will allow the aff to spend more time with their friends and to work at the job they want.

B. *How do you respond to a Case?*

The **NEGATIVE (NEG)** team should attack the aff's arguments about Inherency, Harms, and Solvency. For example, the parents might respond to the extended curfew argument by saying:

Your current 10 pm curfew is only temporary. We already agreed that you could have a 12 am curfew after your next birthday. You can wait until then.

Your curfew can't be hurting your social life that much, because you have lots of friends. And those friends also have 10 pm curfews, so what are all these late events that they are going to? And if you have friends I don't know about who don't have curfews, they are probably up to no good, and I don't want you hanging out with them.

Last week you said you didn't want to work, now you do? We agreed that you are too busy with school, debate, and track to work. And anyway, it's illegal for kids your age to work that late. I don't believe that any job for teens requires those kinds of late hours.

The neg responds to the aff's Inherency argument by pointing out that the aff's 12 am curfew plan is already scheduled to happen later. That means that even if nothing else changes, the benefits of the plan will happen soon anyway.

The neg responds to the aff's Friends Harm by arguing that the teen has lots of friends. The curfew isn't actually reducing the amount of friendships. The neg refutes the aff's Job Harm by arguing that the teen doesn't even want a job. You can't be Harmed by not getting something you don't want.

The neg responds to the aff's argument that the plan solves the Friends Harm by saying that the teen's friends all have to be home by 10 pm as well. The plan can't solve, because the friends can't stay out later anyway.

Finally, the neg responds the aff's argument that the plan solves the Job Harm by saying that there aren't jobs for teens that requires staying out past 10 pm. The plan cannot solve If there aren't any jobs that require working late, because being able to stay out late won't help the teen get a job.

C. *What is a case advantage?*

Every case advantage will have three parts (Uniqueness, Solvency, and Impact) and some advantages will have an additional part called an Internal Link. These parts all work together to tell a story of how the world will be better if the judge decides to pass the affirmative's plan. A full advantage scenario would sound something like this:

1. *Currently, the average temperature of the world is heating up due to global warming. (2) The plan will stop this by building nuclear plants and shutting down coal plants - which will substantially decrease our carbon dioxide emissions. (3) This decrease will be enough to prevent us from hitting the tipping point of 2 degrees of global heat increase, at which point we would not be able to reverse warming. (4) This is good because global warming would cause extinction by overheating the environment and killing all plants*

UNIQUENESS is the first part of an advantage and establishes what is happening in the world right now. This is important because the affirmative will argue that they change the world for the better, and need to be able to say that the good results of the plan can't be gotten without doing the plan. If the judge can get the same good thing without doing the plan then there is no reason to do the plan, so the affirmative needs to establish Uniqueness for their scenario. In the above example (1) establishes uniqueness because it tells us what the world is like right now.

SOLVENCY is the second part of an advantage scenario and describes how the affirmative plan actually changes the world. In conjunction with the uniqueness, the solvency shows how the plan will change the world as it is to bring about a better result or to avoid something bad from happening. Essentially, solvency shows how the plan solves a problem. In the above example (2) establishes solvency because it tells us how the plan actually solves the problem.

The **INTERNAL LINK** is a part of an advantage scenario which may be required to bridge a piece of solvency evidence and a piece of impact evidence. Sometimes, the connection between what a plan actually does in the solvency and how it solves the problem isn't clear or intuitive. Adding some evidence to bridge that gap makes it much easier to understand. In the above example only (3) is an internal link because it connects what the plan does to how it solves global warming, but in a real scenario you could have as many Internal links as you like - but beware, every internal link adds another place you can be attacked!

The **Impact** is the final part of an advantage scenario and establishes why the plan is a good idea. Although some impacts may intuitively seem good (like growing the economy or preventing deaths) the impact card lets you know how large the impact is and gives you reasons to explain to the judge why they should be convinced that your impact is enough to persuade them to vote for the plan. In the above example part (4) is the impact because it shows why global warming would be a bad result.

D. *How do you respond to a case advantage?*

The negative team can attack the advantage scenario's uniqueness, solvency, internal link, and impact. For example, a negative team responding to the above scenario might say something like the following:

- (1) *The current average temperature of the planet is not increasing, it is actually cooling. (2) Building nuclear power plants won't solve the problem because their construction and maintenance emits as much carbon dioxide as coal plants. (3) There is no such thing as a 'tipping*

point', we can always cool the planet. (4) Global warming would not cause extinction because humans can build new buildings, go underground, or go into space.

As the negative **you don't have to respond to all the aff's arguments** - choose which ones you think are useful. Let's look at each argument point by point to see how this could work.

By attacking the **UNIQUENESS** the negative can show that there is no reason to do the plan because the plan doesn't actually change the world in any meaningful way. In the example above, if the negative wins that the average temperature is actually cooling then it doesn't matter if the plan will cool it by more since in a cooling world global warming won't happen.

By attacking the **SOLVENCY** the negative can show that the plan doesn't actually do anything that will change the world for the better, so there is no reason for the judge to vote affirmative. In the example above, if it is true that running nuclear plants emits as much carbon dioxide as coal plants then there's no reason to think that the affirmative plan would decrease global warming.

The negative also has the option to do a **SOLVENCY TURN** - which is where the negative demonstrates that the affirmative actually causes the problem it claims to solve. In order to win this you need to win uniqueness defense and read a piece of 'solvency turn' evidence. For example, if the negative would have made the following argument:

Currently the temperature of the planet is not increasing, it is cooling. Additionally, the mining, refining, transportation, and care of uranium for nuclear power plants actually takes more gas than burning coal does. So doing the plan will increase CO2 emissions.

By attacking the **IMPACT** the negative team can show that even if the affirmative does solve the problem, it's not really a big deal so there is no reason to vote affirmative.

The negative also has the option to **IMPACT TURN** the advantage scenario by arguing that the result of the plan would be bad, rather than good. In the above scenario it might look like this:

Global warming would actually be good because it would unthaw huge chunks of the planet like Eastern Russia and allow us to farm there - solving world hunger.

E. What is a disadvantage?

A **DISADVANTAGE (DISAD or DA)** is a set of arguments that explain how the aff's plan causes a problem. Usually, this is an argument the neg will make in their very first speech. Imagine the neg makes this disad argument about the aff's curfew extension plan:

Right now, you are earning good grades. But if your curfew gets extended, you'll spend more time out of the house, not studying. Then your grades will drop. And you won't get into college. Without a college education, you won't be able to get a good paying job. Also, most people meet their future spouse in college, so you'll miss out on finding a good life partner. So you'll end up poor and alone.

Like the aff's case, a disad has several different parts. The first part is showing what is happening right now. The neg needs to show that the problem isn't already happening, because if it is, then there's no reason to blame the plan for the problem. This is similar to the idea of inherency, but in a disad, we call it **UNIQUENESS**. In this example, the Uniqueness evidence is that right now the teen's grades are good.

The second thing the disad has to do is explain how the plan causes a change in the way things are right now. That's important because if the plan isn't responsible for the problem, then the problem isn't a reason to reject the plan. Arguments about whether the plan causes a particular change are called **LINK** arguments. In this case, the link is that the plan will cause the teen to cut back on studying.

The last thing the disad has to do is explain why the change caused by the plan is bad. That's important because if it isn't bad, there isn't actually a problem with the Plan. Arguments about how bad the problem is are called **IMPACT** arguments. In this case, the impact is that the teen will end up poor and alone.

Often, the link and the impact aren't clearly connected to each other. That's the case in this disad. How does less studying cause you to end up poor and alone? The disad may need to make additional arguments to connect the link to the impact. These types of arguments are called **INTERNAL LINKS**. In this case, the internal link chain is that less studying causes poor grades, which prevents the teen from getting into college, which stops them from getting a good paying job and finding a spouse, which means they will be poor and alone.

F. How do you respond to a disadvantage?

The aff team should attack the neg's uniqueness, link (including any internal links), and impact arguments. For example, the teen might say:

My last report card was worse than usual, because I'm so miserable from missing my friends. Being able to stay out later also means that I can study with my friends, and studying in a group is much more effective than studying alone. I'll be much happier, which will help me stay focused in school. Then I can get my grades back on track. But even if that doesn't work and I end up unemployed and single, it won't be that bad, because I'll always have the love and support of my parents, right?

The aff responds to the neg's uniqueness arguments by pointing out that their grades are already low. If the problem of the disad happens because of low grades, it will happen even if the Plan never goes into effect. That means the problem isn't a reason to reject the plan.

The aff responds to the neg's Link argument by stating that they will actually study more, since they can stay out later to study with friends. This type of argument is called a **TURN**, because it reverses the direction of the disad. Instead of the disad being a reason to reject the plan, it is now another reason to prefer it.

The aff responds to the neg's first internal link argument by also trying to turn it. Since the plan will make the teen happier, they will be able to do better in school.

Lastly, the aff responds to the neg's Impact argument by arguing that the impact isn't that bad. They won't need a good job and loving partner, because their parents will love and support them.

G. What is the process of cross-examination?

After every constructive speech (the first four speeches) the speaker will be questioned by a member of the opposing team. This time is called **CROSS EXAMINATION** (or Cross-X or CX). The goal of this questioning time is different for each person speaking - we'll refer to the two people as the **Questioner** and the **Answerer**.

Questioner

For the Questioner the goal is to **demonstrate that there are flaws or gaps in the opponent's arguments**. Rather than simply saying this, the job of the Questioner is to get the Answerer to admit that there are flaws by pressing them with well worded, meaningful questions. Typical questions like this sound something like, "How do we know your case will do enough to solve the problem?" or "Is our affirmative plan the only thing that could cause the Disadvantage?"

Cross Examination can also be a good time to **set up an argument you want to make**. For example, if you want to run a Spending Disad in the 1NC and you're questioning the 1AC you should probably ask them something like, "How much does the plan cost to do?" or even more specifically, "Wouldn't the plan cost over 20 billion dollars?"

Cross Examination is also **a good time to get caught up** if you don't understand the other team's arguments. It's ok to admit you missed something or don't see how two points connect - if you missed it the judge probably did too. Feel free to ask the other team something like, "In your own words explain what problem you think your affirmative solves."

As Questioner **what you shouldn't do is ask gotcha questions** to try and show that the other team doesn't know something which is not meaningful. For example, if one of their pieces of evidence uses an acronym once in a throwaway sentence don't ask them, "What does that acronym mean?" to try and embarrass them. Judges don't like it and it makes you look like you don't have any real questions to ask. Treat your opponent how you'd like to be treated.

Answerer

As Answerer your job is **fully and cleverly answer the questions** posed by the Questioner. This could mean fully explaining what your evidence or arguments mean to a confused opponent. It could mean cleverly answering a question you know is setting up an argument. It could also mean that you'll have to explain arguments outside the text of the evidence - for example explaining how to pieces of evidence relate to each other. Ultimately, you're going to have to use your wisdom and wits as the Answerer because the Questioner will always be trying to trick you. That being said, you should still never lie or exaggerate the truth, do what you can with what you have - if you really are missing an argument or something went wrong you'll have a chance to fix it in your next speech.

H. What is a counterplan?

A counterplan is an argument the negative team presents with the intention to persuade the judge that a course of action which is different from the affirmative's plan is superior to the affirmative's plan.

In order for the negative to successfully make a counterplan they have to prove two things: a net benefit and competition. The **NET BENEFIT** shows how the counterplan is superior to the affirmative plan - it may (1) solve the problem better, (2) introduce new advantages the plan can't capture, or (3) avoid problems that the affirmative plan will cause. Any one of these three reasons is sufficient. As an example, imagine the affirmative and negative are arguing about where to get something to eat and the negative makes the following counterplan:

The affirmative team and us agree that we need food to satisfy our hunger, but we think going to Piz̃zza Hut is a bad idea. The negative thinks we should go to Taco Bell instead. We have three reasons. First, Taco Bell serves food faster so we will solve our problem of being hungry more quickly. Second, Taco Bell serves tacos which is the best type of food and Piz̃zza Hut doesn't. And third, Piz̃zza Hut only has greasy options which are bad for your health - Taco Bell has organic and healthy options which aren't bad for your health.

Although the above argument might sound good, the negative hasn't fully completed their argument yet. The affirmative could come back and say something like, 'we agree with all the negative's points, that's why we should go to Taco Bell and Pizza Hut.' In order to prevent this, the negative also needs to show that the counterplan is **COMPETITIVE**. Competitive means the counterplan is a reason to reject the plan - that they can't be done at the same time. If doing both the plan and the counterplan together is a good idea, then the counterplan isn't competitive and there would be no reason for the judge not to vote to affirm the affirmative's plan at the same time as the counterplan - resulting in an affirmative team win. So the negative would have to say something like this:

Taco Bell and Piz̃zza Hut are on opposite ends of town and we only have enough gas in our car to drive to one or the other but not both - so we have to choose which one we want.

This addition would make it so that the judge will have to choose between the affirmative's plan and the negative counterplan, establishing competition.

I. How do you respond to a counterplan?

There are two primary ways for the affirmative to respond to a **COUNTERPLAN**. The affirmative could attack the net benefit, the competition, or both. If the affirmative proves there is no net benefit or that the counterplan is not competitive then there is no reason the judge should vote for the counterplan instead of the affirmative's plan.

In order for the affirmative to successfully **ATTACK THE NET BENEFIT** they have to show that the counterplan is not more useful than the affirmative plan. They have several options to do this. They could show (1) that the counterplan doesn't

solve the affirmative plan as well as the affirmative does, (2) that the affirmative also solves any new advantages the counterplan solves, or (3) that the counterplan doesn't avoid any problems that are caused by the affirmative plan or that the affirmative also avoids any new problems. For example, we could imagine an affirmative team responding to the argument made by the negative by saying:

The counterplan to go to Taco Bell is a bad idea - it is still preferable to go to Piz̃zza Hut. We will respond to their three arguments in order. First, although Taco Bell is further away, so any time they'd make up in faster service will be lost as additional driving time. Second, piz̃zza is a better type of food than tacos, and Taco Bell doesn't serve piz̃zza. Third, Piz̃zza Hut also serves healthy food - they have salads and thin crust piz̃zas with veggies which are very healthy.

If the affirmative successfully persuades the judge that any of the three above arguments is true they could defeat the counterplan - however, it is more likely that the affirmative will be successful if they rebut all of the negative's claims about the net benefit. The affirmative also has another strategy available to them, which is to **TURN THE NET BENEFIT**. This functions exactly the same way a turn to a disadvantage does, by showing what the negative thought was a problem for the affirmative is actually a good thing. For example if the affirmative said:

It is actually a good thing that Piz̃zza Hut doesn't have healthy options. Studies show that if you reward yourself with the occasional unhealthy meal you will be more likely to eat healthily in your other meals. Going to Piz̃zza Hut this one time will lead to better overall healthy behavior.

The affirmative can also **ATTACK THE COMPETITION** of the counterplan by showing that the counterplan and plan can be done together. This argument is called a permutation or perm. If both the counterplan and plan can be done together then there is no reason to prefer the counterplan over the plan. For example, the affirmative could make two perms in this case:

Perm: We should buy more gas so that we can go to both Taco Bell and Piz̃zza Hut.

Perm: We should go to the mall where they have both a Taco Bell and Piz̃zza Hut.

J. What is Topicality?

TOPICALITY is a negative off-case argument that basically says the affirmative is cheating at debate because their plan does not actually affirm the resolution. A topicality argument contains 4 parts: Interpretation, Violation, Standards, and Voters.

INTERPRETATION: You offer a definition for a word or phrase in the resolution. This will require some sort of evidence about what the word or phrase means, usually from a dictionary. You explain why the Affirmative plan text does not meet the interpretation.

STANDARDS: Standards are the reasons why your interpretation of the resolution is best. The typical standards are:

Standard	Description
Bright Line	Only our definition makes it really clear what types of plans are topical and what types aren't.
Education	Only our definition makes sure the debate focuses on the issues that are more important to learn about than the issues the Affirmative's plan discusses.
Grammar	Only our definition is consistent with English grammar, and makes it obvious what the resolution is supposed to mean.
Ground	Only our definition makes sure that the debate is fair. Both the Affirmative and the Negative can make lots of good arguments if we use our definition

Limits	Our definition makes sure there is the right amount of variety in Affirmative plans.
Intent to Define	Our author is attempting to define the word which makes it more accurate and useful.
Expert Opinion	Our author has the experience and knowledge to correctly interpret what this word means so you should prefer our definition.
Universality	This definition covers all cases of its use which is more useful and applicable.

In each case, it is not enough to simply claim that your interpretation meets the standard. You need to explain exactly how your interpretation meets it.

VOTERS- Reason(s) why the judge should vote negative if the plan does not meet the interpretation.

K. How does the affirmative responds to topicality?

The affirmative team will typically respond at each level of the Negative’s argument, using the following:

1. **WE MEET:** You explain how your plan actually meets the interpretation offered by the Negative. For example, you might say the IDEA affirmative meets ‘substantial’ because when you remove the \$24 billion the Department of Education spends on higher education the remaining elementary/secondary budget is small enough where the plan’s \$17 billion is actually more than 40 percent of the budget.
2. **COUNTER-INTERPRETATION:** You offer a different definition of the word or phrase than the Negative. You need to explain how your plan meets the counter-interpretation. For example, you might say that a better definition of ‘substantial’ would be \$7.7 billion, which is less than the plan spends. Therefore, the plan is topical.
3. **STANDARDS:** If you offer a counter-interpretation, you need to explain why your counter-interpretation is better than the Negative’s interpretation. You can use any of the standards outlined above to do that. When arguing about limits, you can also remind the judge that the Core Files limits the debate quite a bit already (*if both sides are using CF*). It’s therefore not important to make sure the interpretations provide good limits. The affirmative’s standards will be largely the same as the negatives, listed above, with the addition of:

Reasonability	The affirmative is <i>reasonably</i> topical. Judges should have a high standard for voting negative because it is such a high value argument for the neg.
---------------	--

L. What is impact calculus?

IMPACT CALCULUS is a theoretical framework for how a judge should evaluate a debate. At the end of the debate, the judge needs some sort of ethical model for determining what the better course of action would be. Many people find it intuitive and obvious to point out things they think are bad or good, but they often don’t have a very well thought out reason for why something is good/bad. This is even more complicated when trying to articulate why two bad things are worse than

each other. The concepts we employ in Policy Debate are meant to help clear this confusion and give a theoretical model for comparing different types of impacts.

Utilitarian vs Deontological ethical systems

In debate there are two main, competing schools of thought about which ethical system would be best to use. These two schools are **Utilitarianism** and **Deontology**.

Utilitarianism is the ethical theory that states we should look at the potential results of our actions and choose the one that maximizes the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Utilitarians generally tend to think that good consequences are things that make people happy, safe, or lead to more meaningful and rich lives. These good things are often called 'utility' which is why the proponents of this system are called utilitarians.

Deontology is the ethical theory that focuses on the intentions rather than the outcomes of actions. Deontology is a word formed from two Greek roots, 'deon' meaning duty and 'ology' which means the study of. So deontology is focused on figuring out what our duties are. Most deontologists believe that our duties come from our ability to be moral agents - specifically to think rationally and exercise our own freedom to make and carry out decisions. For this reason, deontologists want to preserve rationality and freedom and encourage people to follow rules which protect and enhance those abilities. Whereas the rule for utilitarians is to increase the maximum good, the rule for deontologists is to act in a way that respects the rationality and freedom of the actor and the acted upon. For a deontologist, the violation of one's rationality or freedom is the ultimate violation because it means that person can no longer act in a moral, or even fundamentally human way.

For example, imagine the following scenario: A malicious, but incompetent scientist wants to make a nuclear bomb strong enough to blow up the world. In their efforts they fail to make a bomb, but instead make a new nuclear power plant strong enough to power the entire world's electricity demand for free for eternity. A utilitarian would say this scientist did a good thing because the consequences are good, despite their evil intent. A deontologist would say this scientist did a bad thing because the intention was evil, despite the good outcomes.

How do we compare impacts?

If you and your opponents are both using the same ethical model for determining what outcome would be best how do you compare your impacts? What makes one plan better than another under utilitarian or deontological theories? In order to answer this question we'll use three concepts: magnitude, timeframe, and probability.

MAGNITUDE is a measurement of how good or bad an action would be. For utilitarians a fairly small magnitude event would be like someone stubbing their toe. Sure, it's mildly annoying, but in the grand scheme of things it's basically nothing at all. A large magnitude impact would be something like Earth exploding, killing all people. This not only affects everyone but maximizes the negative amount of utility for them. For deontologists a small magnitude might be ignoring a relatively unimportant duty in a single situation, like failing to signal when you're about to turn (you've disrespected the ability for others to act rationally and exercise their freedom in relation to your action, but you haven't removed their fundamental rationality/freedom). A large magnitude would be something like advocating for oppression of others - removing their ability to enact their will and denying their rationality. Deontologists would say you have a 'moral obligation' to resist this type of thinking in all cases.

TIMEFRAME is a measurement of how quickly an action would happen. For utilitarians, the faster a timeframe is the more important it is. A utilitarian might say the following: If Plan A causes a nuclear war tomorrow, and Plan B causes one in 100 years, then at least we have 100 years to enjoy ourselves and we could possibly find a way to prevent it. For deontologists timeframe matters less because it is not an ethical theory concerned with outcomes. Taking an action with bad intentions - whether the harm happens right away or in 100 years - is still bad the moment you do it. For deontologists every impact is short timeframe because it is always happening at the time the judge makes a decision.

PROBABILITY is a measurement of how likely an action is to occur. This is very important for utilitarians because if the consequence is unlikely, then generally it's not a very important impact. For example, even if the impact were the destruction of Earth, if the probability of it happening is .0000000000000001% then it may not even be worth worrying about because it is so unlikely. For deontologists the probability of a scenario happening is less important since the consequence of actions is less important than the intention of the actor. Even if the action is unlikely, but still wrong, deontologists would say you still have a strong obligation to avoid doing it.

M. What is a Kritik?

A **KRITIK** (or K) is a set of arguments that explain how the underlying values of the aff's plan contribute to or cause a problem. Usually, this is an argument the Neg will make in their very first speech. Imagine the neg makes this Kritik argument about an aff's plan to move elephants from circuses to zoos:

The affirmative is correct that elephants don't belong in zoos, but they are still wrong about keeping them in zoos. The fundamental problem is not where the elephants are, but the idea that humans can use animals for human entertainment. This belief that animals only exist for human ends is anthropocentrism - the belief that the world revolves around human values. This belief causes the oppression against elephants, but also the oppression and death of all animals. Only by freeing the elephants and respecting the lives of all animals can we solve the underlying problem of anthropocentrism which is the real cause of the Affirmative's impacts.

Like the aff's Case, a Kritik has several different parts. The first part explains how the affirmative's case contributes to a problematic value system (such as racism, sexism, ableism, etc). Arguments about whether the plan contributes to those problematic systems are called **LINK** arguments. In the above case, the link is that the plan keeps using animals for human ends.

The second thing the Kritik has to do is explain why the change caused by the plan is bad. That's important because if it isn't bad, there isn't actually a problem with the Plan. Arguments about how bad the problem is are called **IMPACT** arguments. In this case, the impact is that animals will continue to be abused and also that the plan won't actually solve the problem.

The final part of a Kritik is the **ALTERNATIVE**. The Alternative shows what other course of action the judge can take which will actually avoid contributing to the problematic value system outlined in the Link and Impact. By enacting the alternative the judge can avoid or reduce the amount of impact that is caused. In the above case the alternative is to free the elephants and other animals.

As with a counterplan, the Kritik Alternative has to establish **COMPETITION** (that the alternative and Affirmative plan can't be done at the same time). If the plan and alternative can be done at the same time then there is no reason to prefer the Kritik over the Affirmative plan. Usually, competition is established through the Link. If the plan links, then it is unlikely that it could both solve the problem while also contributing to it. In the above case it would be impossible to free the animals as well as keep them in zoos, so there is competition established.

N. How does the affirmative respond to a Kritik?

The aff team should attack the neg's link, impact, and alternative arguments. For example, the aff might respond to the above argument by saying:

We do not contribute to anthropocentrism. In fact, even if we did increase anthropocentrism it wouldn't matter because anthropocentrism is not a meaningful impact. Anthropocentrism doesn't result in any deaths, not doing the plan would. Additionally, the alternative won't solve the problem - just letting animals roam free doesn't mean people will stop using them. So they don't even solve their own problem. Finally, we could do both the plan and alternative by releasing all the animals who would survive in the wild and those who wouldn't survive in the wild can live in zoos.

The aff responds to the neg's Link argument by stating that the plan won't actually contribute to problematic value system of anthropocentrism. Therefore, if the plan doesn't increase it, there is no reason to reject the plan. The aff could also make a **LINK TURN** argument, which would go something like this:

Zoos rehabilitate animals in a simulated, safe natural environment which is best for their well-being which means the case is not anthropocentric but instead animal centered.

Second, the aff responds to the neg's Impact argument by arguing that the Impact isn't that bad. Anthropocentrism doesn't matter as much as the case impacts do, so the judge should still evaluate the case before the the Kritik. The aff could also make an **IMPACT TURN** argument, which would go something like this:

Increasing anthropocentrism is actually good because it makes people's lives better. We need to test on animals to cure diseases and test other important products.

Notably, if the aff made both the link turn and impact turn argument they'd be **DOUBLE TURNING** themselves by functionally saying that the plan decreases anthropocentrism and that anthropocentrism is good.

Third, the aff makes the argument that the **ALTERNATIVE WON'T SOLVE** the problem. If the aff wins this argument then there is no reason to prefer the alternative over the case, since there is no way to solve the problem the neg outlines.

Lastly, the aff makes the argument that the plan and alternative can be done at the same time - this is a **PERMUTATION** argument. If the aff wins this argument then the judge will vote affirmative because they can get the advantage of doing the plan as well as the advantage of doing the alternative.

Core Files Vocabulary 2019-2020

I. Ukraine Definitions

Arms: weapons and ammunition

Ukraine: large country in Eastern Europe

Kerch Strait: a strait (a narrow passage of water connecting two seas or two large area of water) connecting the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, making it of strategic importance to the Russian navy

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization - created in 1949, was a military alliance of US allies, now consists of 29 countries and 70% of military spending globally

Expansionist: policy or practice of expanding

Kiev: capital and most populous city of Ukraine, located in the north-central part of the country

Miscalculation: a mistake in calculation or planning

Soviet Union: USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics); the new communist state that took over after the Russian Empire

Alliance: a bond or connection

Geo-strategic: foreign policy guided by geographic factors

Sphere of influence: a country in which another country has power to affect developments

II. Taiwan Definitions

Brink: The point of some causal threshold just before some impact is to occur.

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization - created in 1949, was a military alliance of US allies, now consists of 29 countries and 70% of military spending globally

Taiwan Crisis: China's push to maintain Taiwan as part of China and occupy the region. Taiwan rejects this idea and wishes to remain independent.

Bilateral relationship: political, economic, or cultural relations between two sovereign states.

III. Saudi Arabia Definitions

Riyadh: Saudi Arabia's capital city and also their largest. It is both the political and economic hub of the country.

Houthi rebels: The Iran-backed Shi'a rebels in Northern Yemen that are fighting the Saudi coalition in Yemen.

Famine: For the past few years, the ongoing crisis in Yemen has led to a famine, or a widespread scarcity of food. Millions of people are without clean drinking water and food, causing this to be the worse humanitarian crisis.

Guardianship system: Under this system, women are legal minors and need the permission of a male relative in order to travel, obtain passports, get married, work, and study abroad, among other restrictions.

Argument Primers

I. Ukraine Affirmatives

During the Obama administration, Obama refused to sell arms to Ukraine, not wanting to get involved in the conflict. Now, Trump is committed to providing support to Ukraine and is looking into expanding the selling of aid making the conflict in Ukraine worse. This means that our relationship with Ukraine has been growing, leading to potential conflict between the US (on behalf of Ukraine) and Russia. The US needs to remove themselves from this equation, not strengthen our connection with Ukraine.

Any conflict between the US and Russia, specifically due to arms sales to Ukraine, would lead to the use of nuclear weapons. And history proves that this will escalate and cause global issues. The risk of any conflict with Russia means that the US must end all support of Ukraine. We need to return to Obama's policy of not selling arms to Ukraine.

For JV/Varsity debaters, there is an additional harms scenario (China-Russia Relations). As the US increases tensions with China and Russia, both countries are looking to become friends and strengthen their (China-Russia) relations. A Russia-China alliance would make arctic militarization highly likely as both countries have discussed the Arctic as a zone of "resistance space" to US pressure. Any arctic militarization increases the likelihood of miscommunication and will cause conflict escalation as the potential for tensions to escalate is high. And this leads to nuclear war, which is a likely scenario with US and Russia owning 95% of nuclear weapons in the world.

By ending arms sales, the US shows Russia that we are respecting their influence in the region. With tensions running high, any more arms sales would worsen this. The plan would ease any conflict with Russia.

II. Taiwan Affirmative

This affirmative case has a very similar storyline to the Ukraine affirmative. There are two harms scenarios; the Taiwan crisis and Relations.

Currently, tensions between the US, China, and Taiwan are high. With the China-Taiwan situation escalating, and US-China relations deteriorating, the likelihood of conflict is high. Trump is planning on selling more arms to Taiwan, which China is not happy about. China has warned the US of intervening in the Taiwan conflict (even Bush and Obama didn't sell F-16 jets to Taiwan, fearing any backlash from China). This, of course, goes nuclear. As China's influence and power grows in the region, the US may need to rethink their foreign policy in the region. Taiwan is a valuable territory to China and any US imposition will lead to nuclear conflict.

As mentioned before, the US needs to make a change in their foreign policy if there is any hope of improving relations with China. Much of the decline in relations can be attributed directly to Trump and his policies and if we want to avoid any catastrophic consequences, changes must be made. The US and China has previously cooperated on many important issues, and any decline in relations can stop cooperation on important issues, specifically, climate change. We need to solve the global warming issue now; according to recent research, we are hitting the tipping point as global temperatures are rising even higher. Any failure to create substantial change can lead to catastrophic outcomes, such as "Hothouse Earth."

By ending arms sales to Taiwan, we put an end to US-China competition and improve relations. Ending US involvement in this conflict can lead to increased cooperation between the US and China as well. Since Taiwan is such an important issue to China, the US removing itself from the equation, can solve any relations conflict between the two countries.

III. Saudi Arabia Affirmative

***Note:** When going over the Saudi Arabia affirmative, a discussion on cultural competency may be helpful. When looking at the Reforms scenario, specifically, it's important to remind your debaters that we do not want to look at these issues through a Western lens and that the issue is far more complicated than looking at women as minors.

We want to make sure we're not attacking a group of people and making any Orientalist remarks, rather we are criticizing specific policies that are in place*

The Saudi Arabia affirmative has two harms scenarios; the Yemen Crisis and Reform. It doesn't focus too much on a great power war or nuclear conflict, but genocide and human rights violations.

Starting with the complicated Yemen crisis, Saudi and Iran have been involved in a proxy conflict through their support of different groups in Yemen. The conflict has essentially been between (Shi'a) Houthi rebels in Northern Yemen and the Saudi-led coalition.

And the ongoing famine and conflict in Yemen can be directly attributed to US arms sales to Saudi. The UN has called the crisis in Yemen the "world's worst humanitarian crisis," in which millions are without food and water. This conflict has led to an increase in child marriage and the spread of disease. Without US aid, the Saudi government would not be able to contribute so heavily in the deaths of thousands of people. For almost four years, Saudi has been aggressively attacking the Houthi rebels, leading to over 22 million people in need of aid, many of them displaced and even more at risk of starvation. Saudi has been able to continue this aggression because of US arms sales (from both the Trump and Obama administrations.) The human rights violations committed against the Yemeni people would not be able to take place without the millions in arms sales. The Saudi coalition is deliberately attacking civilian areas and infrastructure; this is not about removing Houthi influence, but about actively creating the worst humanitarian crisis. Ending military support to Saudi is the only way to end the intensity of conflict in Yemen. Saudi Arabia is able to commit such atrocities because of access to US arms; removing our supply of arms, can not only force a cease-fire, but also help the millions of people starving because of the air and naval blockade set up by the Saudi government. Without US support, Saudi is more likely to end any further aggression and attempt at peace talks and negotiation.

Continuing US arms sales to Saudi overlooks their in-country human rights violations. Continuous US support of the Saudi government signals to them that they can continue with their human rights violations in Yemen and Saudi. With the death of Jamal Khashoggi and the crisis in Yemen, the US must hold Saudi Arabia accountable for their actions. Ending arms sales to Saudi is the first step in putting an end to human rights violations, it sends a signal to Saudi that we will no longer overlook their atrocities at home and abroad. Because of how much Saudi relies on US weaponry and support, an end to arms sales will pressure the Saudi government to change their policies. Pressure on the Saudi government is increasingly important to putting an end to the guardianship system. For the past few years, Saudi has committed to ending guardianship, but has failed to do so. Pressure from one of their most influential allies can change that. Guardianship systematically oppresses women, making them legal minors that often are trapped in abusive environments. This system denies women basic human rights without the permission of their male guardians. With this system (unofficially) in place, freedom for Saudi women is basically nonexistent. This everyday violence can be found in all aspects of life (political, social, economic, etc.) It is important to identify and acknowledge violence against Saudi women as this leads to other forms of violence, many of which we are seeing happen in Saudi Arabia under the guardianship system. Any continuous form of violence against women, under the guardianship system, is a push to devaluing certain forms of life.

IV. Elections Disadvantage

The Elections DA claims that right now the Democrat will win the 2020 Presidential Election, the plan would make the Democrats look weak on Russia policy, that would make Trump win, and a Trump reelection means global warming. Given all the press with Russia and the 2016 election, Russia relations and foreign policy is a large concern of the voters. President Trump's pro-business platform and withdrawing from the Paris Agreement makes emission reduction unlikely during a Trump Presidency.

V. Alliances Disadvantage

The Alliance DA is an important core DA to have this year. Our version focuses on the US-Japan alliance. The DA claims that right now US-Japan relations are strong, but that Japan looks to the relations the US has with other countries to see if the security alliance is credible. If the US stops backing Ukraine, Japan becomes worried about

their own security alliance and starts to build nuclear weapons. This build-up of nuclear weapons by Japan would lead to a war with China, given the current and historical tensions between these two countries.

VI. Topicality

The topicality included in the core files focuses on the word “substantial” in the resolution. The argument is that substantial means a minimum of 2% and because the US sells so many arms, that the affirmative is not 2% of that total arm sales. This is important to limit small affirmatives and guarantee negative ground, which is a voting issue for fairness and education.

VII. Consult NATO Counterplan

The Consult NATO Counterplan is the CP in the core files this year. NATO is a military alliance created during the Cold War to counteract the influence of the Soviet Union (now Russia). The CP results in a binding consultation with NATO, meaning that if NATO says yes to the affirmative it is done, but if NATO says no, then the affirmative is not done. The counterplan argues that consulting NATO is important to NATO’s strategy, which is necessary to deter terrorism.

VIII. Feminist International Relations Kritik

The Feminist International Relations Kritik (Fem IR K) is a popular kritik on international topics. The kritik argues that rather than using the masculine views of securitization and militarism that the affirmative uses, that we should study international relations through a lens of feminist IR. Any Aff claims of war recreates dominant, masculine scholarship in policymaking.

Highlighting/Annotating Cards

Directions: On the following page, there is a sample card from the Ukraine affirmative. This card can be used as an example of a good card with strong highlighting.

Three Parts of a Card:

1. **Tag: Summary of what your card says**
2. **Source**
3. **Body: Shows the source/article itself.**

Underlining vs. Highlighting:

- We UNDERLINE the important bits of the source that help us make our argument.
- We HIGHLIGHT the MOST important bits of the source that we read aloud. These should be the biggest takeaways of the source, or its biggest warrants.
- So, we underline MORE and highlight LESS.

Mini-Lesson on Highlighting:

A. Look at the following card, and have your students address the following questions:

1. What is different between the underlined portions and the highlighted?
2. What is the key warrant of the card?

B. Have students practice highlighting with other cards. Print out a 4-5 different cards, and have students group up to highlight them. Have the students present their highlighting choices to the group, answering the questions from Part A. Then, if time, have students do them individually.

Trump is currently committed to increasing arms sales to Ukraine.

Semchuk 2019

[Liana Semchuk, 3-27-2019, "Ukraine: US arms sales making big business money while ordinary people pay the price," Conversation, <https://theconversation.com/ukraine-us-arms-sales-making-big-business-money-while-ordinary-people-pay-the-price-114238> MYY]

Selling lethal weapons to Ukraine is the equivalent of pouring kerosene onto a flame. But ongoing hostilities between Ukraine and Russia – including the Kerch strait crisis, which began late last year when Russia intercepted three Ukrainian vessels and took 24 crew members captive – are also a major business opportunity for the world’s largest defence contractors. Despite the risk of serious escalation, these companies continue to provide Ukraine with lethal aid so it can defend itself against Russia – for a price, of course. The US special representative for Ukraine negotiations, Kurt Volker, stated recently that Washington remains committed to providing support to Ukraine and its military, including anti-tank systems. He even hinted that the US is considering expanding the types of lethal aid that it could begin selling to Ukraine, saying: “We also need to be looking at things like air defence and coastal defence.” This is a troubling prospect. In March, US army general Curtis Scaparrotti said that the US could also bolster the Ukrainian military’s sniper capabilities. Speaking to the Senate Armed Services Committee, he said: There are other systems, sniper systems, ammunition and, perhaps looking at the Kerch Strait, perhaps consideration for naval systems, as well, here in the future as we move forward. This comment has been widely underreported and has not received nearly as much attention as it deserves considering the potential consequences. At worst, more lethal aid could escalate the conflict further. At best, it will continue to keep alive a conflict that has already claimed more than 10,000 lives. Finding a straightforward policy alternative is difficult, but sending more lethal aid to achieve the unattainable goal of Ukraine defeating Russia is certainly no solution.

Flowing Shorthand for Core Files 19-20

leads to, will cause	=>
will increase	↑
will decrease	↓
definitions	def
is, equals	=
money, spending	\$
opponent fails to address argument	drop
government	gov
status quo	SQ
impact	!
United States Federal Government	USFG
Saudi Arabia	SAU
China	CHN
Taiwan	TWN
Ukraine	UKR
Yemen	YEM
Human rights	HR
Counterplan	CP

number	#
outweighs	o/w
plan/policy	□
question	?
solvency, solved	□
with	w/
without	w/o
people	ppl
harms	H
affirmative	aff
negative	neg
Military	mil
Nuclear war	NW/nuc war
Relations/relationship	Rel
Global warming	GW
Kritik	K
Disadvantage	DA
Evidence	ev.

Introduction to Mini-Debates

Mini-debates are the best activity to practice. They allow for more kids to debate in a single practice, and they focus in on a specific strand or argument.

Mini-debates cannot contain entire speeches. What should be debated are single advantages, solvency, topicality, disadvantages, kritiks or parts of a kritik, counterplans or parts of counterplans, and framework. Use the timing structure below to help construct mini-debates, although the timing can be tweaked depending on argument.

2 min – 1 AC

2 min – 1 NC

2 min – 2AC

3 min – Block

2 min – 1 AR

2 min – 2NR

3 min – 2AR

Prep – 3 min per team

Since students are notoriously disorganized, it's crucial to pull cards ahead of time so that they can easily debate. How far into the debate round you pull or set up cards is up to you. In the Activities section of this manual, there are sample mini-debates you can begin to use.

Evidence Pulling Activities for Affirmatives and Case Negatives

Directions: After reading cases, use the following graphic organizers with your students to have them start pulling evidence based on the specific, listed claims of each affirmative and negative.

Evidence Pulling Activity #1: Ukraine Affirmative (Rookie/Novice)

A. Story of the Aff: In 2-4 sentences, summarize the main gist of this affirmative.

B. Fill out the following boxes using last name and date of card that proves the listed claims true.

Claim	Evidence Proving Claim
Inherency: Trump is currently committed to increasing arms sales to Ukraine.	
Ukraine Crisis: Arms sales entangles the US and Ukraine. This is bad because Ukraine uses its relations with the US to antagonize Russia.	
Ukraine Crisis: U.S-Russia military confrontation over Ukraine escalates to nuclear war.	
Solvency: Ending arms sales reduces tensions with Moscow and stops conflict escalation.	
Solvency: Plan solves- ending arms sales respects Russia's influence. That's key to better relations.	

Evidence Pulling Activity #1.5: Ukraine Negative (Novice/Rookie)

A. Story of the Neg: In 2-4 sentences, summarize the main gist of the negative.

B. Fill out the following boxes using last name and date of card that proves the listed claims true, as well as what specific affirmative claim it is countering.

Negative Claim	Evidence Proving Claim	What is this countering on aff?
Putin's popularity is low now, meaning the risk of diversionary war is high. Expanding arms sales are key to stop him.		
Ukraine is the most important place for containment. Arms sales are key.		
Turn: Failure to check Russia causes war between great powers.		
Turn: US support for Ukraine through arms sales demonstrates support for democracy.		
Turn: US support for democracy is critical to challenge the spread of authoritarianism. That is key to global stability.		
No solvency – US sanctions on Russia prevent relations improvements		

Evidence Pulling Activity #2: Ukraine Affirmative (JV/Varsity)

A. Story of the Aff: In 2-4 sentences, summarize the main gist of this affirmative.

B. Fill out the following boxes using last name and date of card that proves the listed claims true.

Claim	Evidence Proving Claim
Inherency: Trump is currently committed to increasing arms sales to Ukraine.	
Ukraine Crisis: Arms sales entangles the US and Ukraine. This is bad because Ukraine uses its relations with the US to antagonize Russia.	
Ukraine Crisis: U.S-Russia military confrontation over Ukraine escalates to nuclear war.	
China-Russia: Tensions with the US push Russia towards China. That improves China-Russia relations.	
China-Russia: Creation of a Russia-China alliance fuels arctic militarization.	
China-Russia: Arctic militarization causes conflict escalation.	
China-Russia: Arctic conflict escalates to nuclear war.	
Solvency: Ending arms sales reduces tensions with Moscow and stops conflict escalation.	
Solvency: Plan solves- ending arms sales respects Russia's influence. That's key to better relations.	

Evidence Pulling Activity #2.5: Ukraine Negative (JV/Varsity)

A. Story of the Neg: In 2-4 sentences, summarize the main gist of the negative.

B. Fill out the following boxes using last name and date of card that proves the listed claims true, as well as what specific affirmative claim it is countering.

Negative Claim	Evidence Proving Claim	What is this countering on aff?
Putin's popularity is low now, meaning the risk of diversionary war is high. Expanding arms sales are key to stop him.		
Ukraine is the most important place for containment. Arms sales are key.		
Turn: Failure to check Russia causes war between great powers.		
Turn: US support for Ukraine through arms sales demonstrates support for democracy.		
Turn: US support for democracy is critical to challenge the spread of authoritarianism. That is key to global stability.		
Alliance won't happen in the arctic – China and Russia have major disagreements.		
No arctic war – countries have set up peaceful methods of dispute resolution.		

No solvency – US sanctions on Russia prevent relations improvements		
---	--	--

Evidence Pulling Activity #3: Taiwan Affirmative

A. Story of the Aff: In 2-4 sentences, summarize the main gist of this affirmative.

B. Fill out the following boxes using last name and date of card that proves the listed claims true.

Claim	Evidence Proving Claim
Taiwan Crisis: Tensions between the US, Taiwan, and China are on the brink.	
Taiwan Crisis: Trump is about to cross a redline with China by selling F16 jets. China has warned the US not to do this.	
Taiwan Crisis: Taiwan crisis escalates to nuclear war. Changing US foreign policy is key.	
Relations: US-China relations are in free fall. Reversing the direction of US policies is key.	
Relations: Declining relations stops cooperation on climate change.	
Relations: Time is running out to solve global warming. Failure to act now results in tipping points that make the world uninhabitable.	
Solvency: Only the plan solves – ending Taiwan arms sales ends US-China competition	
Solvency: Ending US arms sales to Taiwan respects China's core interests and solves relations.	

Evidence Pulling Activity #3.5: Taiwan Negative

A. Story of the Neg: In 2-4 sentences, summarize the main gist of the negative.

B. Fill out the following boxes using last name and date of card that proves the listed claims true, as well as what specific affirmative claim it is countering.

Negative Claim	Evidence Proving Claim	What is this countering on aff?
Turn: The plan is accommodation that emboldens Chinese aggression.		
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.		
Status quo is the best option – currently, strategic risks balance on the Chinese and Taiwanese sides and prevents rash action by either.		
Turn: Reduction in commitment to Taiwan causes it to pursue nuclear weapons. US support gives us leverage that stops proliferation.		
Taiwan pursuit of nuclear weapons causes Chinese first strikes.		
Trade war wrecks relations – plan can't solve.		
We can't solve warming because Trump is president.		

Turn: The US and Taiwan are increasing their efforts to spread democracy now. Arms sales key.		
US support for democracy is critical to challenge the spread of authoritarianism. Democracy is key to global stability.		
Impact: Democracy is key to solve warming. This turns case.		

Evidence Pulling Activity #4: Saudi Arabia Affirmative

A. Story of the Aff: In 2-4 sentences, summarize the main gist of this affirmative.

B. Fill out the following boxes using last name and date of card that proves the listed claims true.

Claim	Evidence Proving Claim
Yemen Crisis: US arms sales to Saudi Arabia fuel the conflict in Yemen.	
Yemen Crisis: Saudi Arabia's war in Yemen creates an ongoing humanitarian crisis. There are preventable deaths happening constantly.	
Yemen Crisis: US arms sales uniquely enable Saudi Arabia's ongoing genocide in Yemen.	
Yemen Crisis: Only ending arms sales can bring an end to hostilities.	
Yemen Crisis: The plan solves. Ending arms sales results in Saudi withdrawal because it depends on US support.	
Reform: Continuing arms sales greenlight Saudi human rights violations at home. Ending arms sales is key.	
Reform: Ending arms sales pressures Saudi Arabia.	

Reform: Increasing pressure now is key to end the guardianship system.	
Reform: The guardianship system denies women basic rights and perpetuates gendered violence.	
Reform: This everyday violence against Saudi women must be prioritized because it's a prerequisite to all other forms of violence.	

Evidence Pulling Activity #4.5: Saudi Arabia Affirmative Negative

A. Story of the Neg: In 2-4 sentences, summarize the main gist of the negative.

B. Fill out the following boxes using last name and date of card that proves the listed claims true, as well as what specific affirmative claim it is countering.

Negative Claim	Evidence Proving Claim	What is this countering on aff?
Ending arms sales doesn't solve – Russia and China just fill in.		
Support good – Ending US support for Saudi Arabia will make the conflict worse.		
Reforms are empirically proven to fail – Saudi Arabia just cracks down in new ways.		
No pressure – ending arms sales is specifically ineffective when attempting to alter a state's domestic policy.		
Turn: Banning arms sales causes the Saudis to lash out by crushing oil supply. That causes a price spike.		
Oil price spikes cause a recession – empirically proven.		

Economic downturn causes Trump to wage diversionary war.		
--	--	--

Mapping Out Disadvantages (DA) Graphic Organizer

DA Name: _____

Uniqueness: Why the impact isn't occurring in the status quo



(Δ is the Greek letter “delta,” meaning change. In this case, it means that the link changes the status quo)

Link: What does the plan change about the status quo that can lead to the impact.



(↓ is a symbol from the philosophy of logic, meaning “leads to.” In every case, the arrow points from the *cause* to the *effect*.)

Impact: the unintended negative consequence of the affirmative plan

Standard 2AC Topicality Graphic Organizer

Directions: While topicality in the Core Files is mapped out, use the following organizer if you encounter a non-Core Files topicality shell. **Remember that most of these are analytical arguments, meaning that they do not require research/evidence. Only Counter-Interpretation needs a citation.*

1) **We meet:** You need to state *why/how* you meet their definition (of whatever term it is). This section might be multiple reasons. You can parse them out---1, 2, 3, 4---if needed. Really make sure to connect how the aff meets the definition; do not simply say we meet.

2) **Counter-Interpretation** – Give your own definition of the term. Make sure that your definition is not too vague or broad. It should still have some limits—meaning that you should not have a definition that could apply to ANY case.

3) **We meet our interpretation** – State the reasons why you meet your interpretation of the term in question.

4) Prefer our interpretation for limits and ground –

Limits: Our interpretation sets a clear, reasonable limit for what is and isn't topical. Limits are good because they ensure predictable, fair ground for both sides.

Ground: We lose the ability to read our best arguments. This hurts equity because they artificially claim the best ground for themselves and exclude our best arguments.

**You can use these canned statements above and then elaborate more if needed.*

5) Prefer our interpretation for fairness and/or education –

You could have arguments for fairness and education or one or the other. Think about the “topicality story” as in, what's your bigger picture?

Fairness: Their interpretation would allow the opposing team to do anything and us to have very little to say in response. The topic is supposed to evenly and fairly divide ground.

Education: Their interpretation of the topic removes the most relevant and valuable parts of the topic. We do debate to learn, which means this is the greatest offense imaginable.

**You can use these canned statements above and then elaborate more if needed.*

6) Reasonability – The affirmative should always argue reasonability. Reasonability is that the aff argues that they've done a “good enough” job of meeting the resolution. Basically, the aff claims that the neg has to prove that it is IMPOSSIBLE to prepare for the aff's case.

Generic Neg Topicality Violation

Interpretation (*What something in the resolution SHOULD mean. Give your neg definition*)
(word or term from resolution) _____ means _____

Violation (*How the aff plan doesn't meet your interpretation*) _____

Standards (*Why your definition is better. Make sure to label each standard below with a letter*)
Predictable Limits (Why the aff plan is unpredictable) _____

Ground (*Why your interpretation gives fair ground for those sides*) _____

Bright Line (*Why your interpretation draws a clear line of what is topical and isn't*) Our interpretation says anything _____

_____ is topical and anything else isn't. This creates a bright line of what is and isn't topical which is beneficial for debate and defines topicality for future debates .

Education (*Why your interpretation is more educational*) _____

Other Standards

Topicality is a Voter (*Why topicality is a voter issue and why affirmative should lose if they aren't topical*)

Competing Interpretations: If the negative presents a better interpretation of the resolution we should win on topicality. It is the affirmative's job to defend their interpretation of the resolution; if ours is better they lose.

Fairness: The affirmative's plan is non-topical, which is unfair to us as the negative. As the negative, we should not have to debate over a non-topical aff, so the judge should vote neg to make the debate space fairer.

Education: Non topical affirmatives hurt education. The neg team has to face arguments totally irrelevant to the resolution, which limits the amount of education the debate space provides. Vote neg to increase education

Other reasons:

Generic Aff Topicality Answers

We Meet (*Why you meet the negative's interpretation of the resolution*) _____

Counter Interpretation (*You give your own interpretation of the resolution and why your plan is topical*)

Counter Standards (*Here you respond to each of their standards and say why your own standards for each issue are better*)

Non Voter (*Respond to each standard the negative read for why aff is a voter. As aff you argue that topicality is not a voter issue, even if the aff.*)

Cross-Examination Drills

Directions: The following drills can be used with virtually any argument to help students prepare better questions.

Cross-Examination Activity #1: CX Preparation

Directions: This is a useful activity only if students have read the material.

1. Have one student read the argument out loud.
2. Group students into small groups of 4-5.
3. Instruct students that they will be creating questions to set up the negative strategy.
4. Give students 8-10 minutes to (1) create the list of seven questions; (2) discuss the intent of the question (the WHY); (3) how they think the affirmative will respond.

Questions	Why are you asking this question?	How do you think the opponent will respond?

Cross-Examination #2: CX Chains

Directions: There are two variations of this activity. Specific directions for each, below.

Version 1: Students CX Teacher

1. Teacher and students should be prepared with having read specific argument (an aff, case neg, a DA, topicality, CP, or K). Don't do this activity for an entire speech; it works better for one argument as it allows for more specific questions.
2. Teacher can read the arguments, or proceed without reading it.
3. Students should be sitting in a line or be assigned a number in order.
4. Students take turns asking CX questions and teacher answers (5-10 min). Teachers answering questions can model appropriate responses.
5. Students should take notes of each asked question.
6. After CX is completed, students can partner or group up and divide their list of questions into good/bad ones.
7. As a whole class, discuss what questions were strongest and which were weakest.
8. Keep teacher responses in mind, too, when address strong/weak questions.

Version 2: Teacher CX Students

1. Teacher and students should be prepared with having read specific argument (an aff, case neg, a DA, topicality, CP, or K). Don't do this activity for an entire speech; it works better for one argument as it allows for more specific questions.
2. Have 1-2 students practice by reading argument aloud.
3. Teacher should have a prepared list of CX questions ready for argument.
4. Line students up or randomly call on students with a CX question to answer (5-10 min)
5. As a class, discuss which student responses were strongest/weakest.
6. Have students with initially weak responses write out a better answer OR as a class or in groups, answer it together.

Sample CX Questions (Generic and for Ukraine Affirmative)

Here are some sample questions to use. The first set (Generic) are just good questions to ask on anything. The second set of questions are negative questions to ask on the Ukraine affirmative (so, after the 1AC).

Generic:

- What is your evidence or warrant for _____? (attacking their evidence/tags)
- What are the credentials of the author of _____ card? (attacking their evidence/author)
- What is the story of the aff/DA/kritik, etc? (forces them to explain their logic)
- What is the time frame for _____? (can set up an impact comparison)

Ukraine Affirmative (for the 2N to ask the 1AC):

- Russia hijacked Ukrainian ships last year?
 - Now you want to end arms sales?
 - Putin wants the US to end arms sales?
 - So we're doing what Putin wants after he took Ukrainian ships?
 - He won't see this as a signal?
- Is Russia involved in other proxy conflict with the US?
- Does the plan end US sanctions on Russia?
- Does the plan end NATO expansion?
- Do Americans like Russia?
- Do US allies like Russia?
- Vladimir Putin tried to undermine US democracy?
 - He invaded Georgia?
 - He's actively involved in the conflict in Syria?
 - He uses any tactics to get his way?
 - But we should trust him?

Sample CX Questions for Disadvantages

Here are some sample questions to use for the aff to use before the 2AC against the DAs.

Alliances DA:

- President Trump has already broken security commitments to allies, why has this not caused the impact?
- If the nuclear umbrella is still in place, why will Japan want to build nuclear weapons?
- How long would it take Japan to build nuclear weapons?

Elections DA:

- Which voters are undecided or likely to change their votes?
- Why is foreign policy a bigger concern to voters than domestic concerns or the impeachment trial?
- What is the tipping point of solving for global warming?

Evidence Comparison Drill for 1st or 2nd Year Debaters

Preparation steps:

- 1) Have the students brainstorm a list of what makes evidence better (i.e. things like author qualifications, use of data or examples, recency if it is a time sensitive issue etc.). Talk to them about those issues and compile a list on the board.
- 2) Explain the difference between **saying your evidence is better** and **nitpicking** the other team's evidence.
 - a. Example #1
 - i. Good: "Our evidence is from 2016, theirs is outdated and from 1988. New scientific studies prove that warming is real and anthropogenic so prefer ours."
 - ii. Not so hot: "Their evidence is old."
 - b. Example #2
 - i. Good: "Our evidence is from a professor of political science who is qualified to talk about relations with India. Theirs is from an unqualified blog post."
 - ii. Not so hot: "Their evidence is from random author."
- 3) Assign students to debate against each other in pairs.
- 4) Give them the evidence that they are using and assign each student card #1 or card #2. Give them a few minutes to think about why their evidence is better.

Debate format:

- 1) Person #1 reads their card.
- 2) Person #2 reads their card.
- 3) Person #1 says that their evidence is better... (maximum of 1 minute).
- 4) Person #2 says that their evidence is better... (maximum of 1 minute).

Note: If your classes like competitions, this is a fun activity to set up as a bracket and declare winners from each round.

Mini Debates

Directions: The following exercises are mini-debates for ONE harms scenario of the Ukraine aff: the Ukraine Crisis; topicality for Taiwan; and the Alliances DA.

1. Print and use the following cards for the debate.
2. Choose 4 students and split into aff and neg.
3. Have students take 3-5 min to prep before debate begins. There are some fill-in-blanks to complete.
4. This debate has cards up through the negative block. For the last three speeches, the students must give a rebuttal.

1AC: Ukraine Crisis

Trump is currently committed to increasing arms sales to Ukraine.

Semchuk 2019

[Liana Semchuk, 3-27-2019, "Ukraine: US arms sales making big business money while ordinary people pay the price," Conversation, <https://theconversation.com/ukraine-us-arms-sales-making-big-business-money-while-ordinary-people-pay-the-price-114238> MYY]

Selling lethal weapons to Ukraine is the equivalent of **pouring kerosene onto a flame**. But ongoing hostilities between Ukraine and Russia – including the Kerch strait crisis, which began late last year when Russia intercepted three Ukrainian vessels and took 24 crew members captive – are also a major business opportunity for the world's largest defence contractors. **Despite the risk of serious escalation**, these companies continue to provide Ukraine with lethal aid so it can defend itself against Russia – for a price, of course. **The US special representative for Ukraine negotiations**, Kurt Volker, **stated** recently **that Washington remains committed to providing support to Ukraine and its military, including anti-tank systems**. **He even hinted that the US is considering expanding the types of lethal aid that it could begin selling to Ukraine**, saying: "We also need to be looking at things like air defence and coastal defence." This is a troubling prospect. In March, US army general Curtis Scaparrotti said that the US could also bolster the Ukrainian military's sniper capabilities. Speaking to the Senate Armed Services Committee, he said: There are other systems, sniper systems, ammunition and, perhaps looking at the Kerch Strait, perhaps consideration for naval systems, as well, here in the future as we move forward. This comment has been widely underreported and has not received nearly as much attention as it deserves considering the potential consequences. **At worst, more lethal aid could escalate the conflict further. At best, it will continue to keep alive a conflict that has already claimed more than 10,000 lives**. Finding a straightforward policy alternative is difficult, but **sending more lethal aid to achieve the unattainable goal of Ukraine defeating Russia is certainly no solution**.

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

Carpenter 2018

[Ted Galen Carpenter, a senior fellow in security studies at the Cato Institute and a contributing editor at the National Interest, 12-10-2018, "Don't Let Ukraine Drag America into War," National Interest, <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/dont-let-ukraine-drag-america-war-38367> MYY]

Washington's security ties to Kiev were already growing to an unhealthy degree, exemplified by the Trump administration's approval of two arms sales, long before the Kerch Strait episode. The administration seemed poised to approve yet another arms deal. American and Ukrainian officials were in "close discussion" for Washington to supply another tranche of powerful weapons for Kiev's fight against Russian-backed secessionist rebels in eastern Ukraine. For instance, Ukrainian Foreign Minister Pavlo Klimkin told reporters this on November 18 after he met with U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo. His announcement also took place barely a week before the clash in the Kerch Strait. Even more worrisome, a strong lobbying effort in favor of admitting Ukraine to NATO keeps surfacing, and successive American administrations have refused to abandon that goal. Under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, giving Kiev NATO membership would obligate the United States to come to Ukraine's defense in the event of war with an outside power. Given Ukraine's strategic importance to Russia, that is a commitment Washington should never undertake. **These various developments indicate that the United States is drifting toward a perilous confrontational policy toward Russia on Ukraine's behalf**. The status of the Kerch Strait or even the broader controversy about Crimea's status can and should be a matter of indifference to America. **It is hard to see how risking a major war with Russia benefits even**

Ukraine (although some Ukrainian nationalists apparently to think that it would), but it is impossible to see how such a course benefits the United States. The Trump administration needs to put far greater distance between U.S. and Ukrainian policies, not close that distance. Americans must not let the Ukrainian tail wag the American dog, or the result could be tragic for all concerned.

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

Thompson 2014

[Thompson, Loren. "Ukraine Crisis: Six Reasons Why U.S. Use Of Military Forces Is Unthinkable." Forbes (13 March 2014). <http://www.forbes.com/sites/lorenthompson/2014/03/13/ukraine-crisis-six-reasons-why-u-s-use-of-military-forces-is-unthinkable/> MYY]

Most Americans seem to understand this — a CNN poll this week found three-quarters of respondents opposed to even giving military aid to Kiev, with far fewer backing use of U.S. forces. Nonetheless, some hardliners seem to think America's military might play a role in forcing Russian leader Vladimir Putin to back away from what they see as a return to the expansionist foreign policies of the Cold War era. Here are six reasons why using U.S. military power in the current crisis would be a strategic miscalculation of epic proportions. 1. Russia has the ability to utterly destroy America. Local conflicts have a way of getting out of control when foreign powers intervene. In any military confrontation between U.S. and Russian forces, there is a danger of escalation not only to conventional combat, but beyond — in other words, to the use of nuclear weapons. That may sound like an improbable scenario, but it's no more outlandish than an assassination attempt by Serbian nationalists leading to a World War, and yet that actually happened — in the same region. Russia has thousands of nuclear warheads, and the only defense America has against such weapons is retaliation in kind. Think of the possibilities. 2. Ukraine is vital to Russian security. The vast plains surrounding Ukraine have seen many invasions since the dawn of history, owing mainly to the fact that there are few natural barriers to keep outsiders at bay. Moscow's response to this security challenge since it emerged as a major power center has been to control as much land as possible — an approach that succeeded in defeating both Napoleon and Hitler when combined with the region's harsh winters. But when the Soviet Union broke up in 1991, the Russians lost most of their land buffer to the West, and now Moscow finds itself within a one-hour plane ride of the Ukrainian border. If you don't see why putting U.S. forces in Ukraine might lead to war, think of how Washington responded to the deployment of Soviet missiles in Cuba.

2AC – Answers to Ukraine Crisis Harms Frontline #1: Arms sales good turn

1. *Extend our Carpenter 2018 evidence - it says* _____

It's better than their evidence because

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

Wainer 2019

[David Wainer, 2-13-2019, "UN Warned of Escalation Risk in Ukraine as Talks Falter," Bloomberg, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-02-13/un-warned-of-escalation-risk-in-ukraine-as-talks-falter> MYY]

The conflict in eastern Ukraine is in danger of escalating, threatening to exacerbate an already precarious humanitarian crisis, a United Nations official warned. "Military advance positions on both parts of the contact line are coming close to each other in the so-called gray areas," Miroslav Jenca, the UN's Assistant Secretary-General for Political Affairs, said at a Tuesday Security Council meeting. "The use of heavy weapons and their deployment in the proximity of the contact line is a reality." More than four years of conflict in rebel-held eastern Ukraine have claimed in excess of 10,000 lives. **Diplomatic efforts have run aground, with the government in Kiev and Russian-backed separatists blaming each other for renegeing on a 2015 peace accord.** In a dramatic renewal of tensions in November, Russian forces fired on Ukrainian warships, injuring crew members and capturing three vessels. Upon Russia's request, the Security Council convened on Tuesday to discuss the so-called Minsk agreements, which have failed to quell the conflict. Though heavy fighting has dwindled in recent years, a low-grade war continues along the border that runs through Donetsk and Luhansk. **Russia's envoy to the UN, Vassily Nebenzia, said the West is exploiting Ukraine in its geopolitical contest with Russia.** Legacy of Ukraine Revolution Rides on March Election: QuickTake "The West bears direct responsibility for everything that is taking place," Nebenzia said. **"They are encouraging provocations by Kiev and readily providing weapons into this country, thus edging it towards reckless actions."**

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

Cohen 2015

[Josh Cohen, 7-2-2015, "Want to escalate U.S.-Russia tension? Arm Ukraine.," Reuters, <http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2015/07/02/want-to-escalate-u-s-russia-tension-arm-ukraine/> MYY] **The lobbying to arm Ukraine** began in February when three of the nation's leading think tanks released a widely-read report arguing for the United States to provide Ukraine with \$3 billion of lethal arms. Since then both the Senate and House passed legislation calling for the United States to arm Ukraine, while Secretary of State Kerry, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter and U.S. Air Force General and NATO Supreme Allied Commander Philip Breedlove publicly advocated this policy. In fact, the only senior official not pushing this agenda is President Barack Obama — though the pressure on him to do so is growing. Washington's legion of escalation **argues for "raising the costs" to Russia** by increasing the number of Russian soldiers killed in Ukraine. The Kremlin has been hiding the number of battlefield casualties in Ukraine from Russian citizens to reduce domestic opposition to the war. **If the volume of casualties became public, some U.S. officials argue, Putin would have to back down from Ukraine** to prevent a domestic backlash. **This rationale is logical on its face, but in practice does not**

account for the gap between the Russian and American stake in Ukraine. Kiev's geopolitical orientation is supremely important to Russia, while American interests' via-a-vis Ukraine are peripheral at best. It's a case of "must have" for the Russians, versus "nice to have" for the United States. If Putin's sky-high approval ratings are anything to go by, he has successfully convinced Russia's citizens that Ukraine is an existential issue for their country, and he cannot now retreat without undermining his political standing at home. Therefore, Putin's likely response to an increase in Kiev's military capabilities would be to double down on his support for the separatists. In a worst-case scenario, Russia could invade Ukraine outright. The end result would be even greater death and suffering for those living in eastern Ukraine — the exact opposite outcome that the West would like to see. Those who still doubt Russia's willingness to escalate should consider what happened in August, when Ukraine's military was on the brink of routing the separatists. Putin poured Russian troops into the Donbass and inflicted a bloody defeat on the Ukrainian forces at Ilovaisk. Russian troops also played a key role helping to defeat Kiev's forces at Debaltseve in February. These incidents show that Putin is prepared to escalate as necessary, and the "Arm Ukraine" advocates do not provide a satisfactory explanation why he would not do so again. Russia's geopolitical interest in Ukraine is also matched by hard power. The Russian military possesses what military strategists call "escalation dominance," and even those in favor of arming Ukraine admit that an American-supplied Ukrainian army still cannot defeat a determined attack by the Russian military. If Kiev appears on the verge of another significant defeat, do those demanding Ukraine be armed stand down? Or do they invoke "American credibility" and demand even tougher countermeasures? How might Moscow escalate even further in return? None of the answers to these questions are clear — and neither is the endgame. Those who support arming Kiev also overlook the possibility that Putin could choose to escalate asymmetrically, outside of Ukraine. Russia already announced its intention to begin supplying Iran with advanced surface-to-air S-300 missiles by 2016. Moscow has promised this before, but then backed down, and Putin has left himself some wiggle room by saying Moscow won't deliver S-300s to Iran "in the near future."

4. Arms won't deter Russia – they cause conflict escalation and back the US into a corner. Menon & Ruger 2017

[Rajan Menon Is The Anne and Bernard Spitzer Professor Of International Relations At The Powell School, City College Of New York, And A Senior Research Fellow At Columbia University's Saltzman Institute Of War And Peace Studies. William Ruger Is Vice President For Research And Policy At The Charles Koch Institute And An Officer In The U.S. Navy Reserve., 10-11-2017, "The Trouble With Arming Ukraine," Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/ukraine/2017-10-11/trouble-arming-ukraine> MYY]

Those who call for sending lethal arms to Ukraine (the United States and some of its NATO allies already train Ukrainian troops, and the United States has been providing nonlethal arms to Ukraine to the tune of \$300 million in 2016 alone) claim that American weaponry will strengthen Kiev's hand and compel Russian President Vladimir Putin to negotiate a just political settlement that ends the war in Ukraine's Donbas region. They're misguided. Worse, their proposal could be dangerous, for Ukraine and the United States. Arming Ukraine won't make Putin cry uncle. Past experience— notably Moscow's stepped-up intervention to save its Donbas clients in the battles for Ilovaisk and Novoazovsk in 2014 and 2015 and Debaltseve in 2015— suggests that Putin will continue to reinforce Russia's proxies, especially if they suffer setbacks at the hands of better-armed Ukrainian troops. Because Russia and Ukraine share a border, Putin can send forces and weapons to the battlefield far faster than the United States can resupply Ukraine. Most importantly, Ukraine matters far more to Russia than to the United States. Indeed, even the advocates for arming Ukraine disavow any intention to send American troops to fight for the Ukrainians, knowing full well that such a recommendation would doom their efforts. By contrast, Putin hasn't hesitated to order Russian troops into battle in the Donbas, where many have been killed. His popularity ratings nevertheless remain sky-high. Eighty-seven percent of Russians support his handling of foreign affairs—about the same as did in 2014. There is no evidence that the war in Ukraine has dented

Putin's popularity, let alone enabled opposition leaders to mobilize support against his government. Yet proponents of providing Ukraine lethal arms suggest that because of the bite of Western sanctions and Russians' mounting unhappiness with the war, Putin desperately wants to escape what they portray as the Donbas quagmire. In fact, although Russia has now endured political isolation and Western economic penalties for over three years as a consequence of Putin's annexation of Crimea and instigation of the war in eastern Ukraine, he has not made a single significant concession or shown any inclination to sacrifice the Donbas insurgents. Instead, he has stuck by them and, as his military escalations in 2014 and 2015 show, bailed them out when necessary. The proposition that Putin won't be provoked by a U.S. decision to send lethal arms to Ukraine amounts to a hunch. It's not supported by evidence, and Putin's past behavior contradicts it. This is not a minor point: if he does ramp up the war and the Ukrainian army is forced into retreat, the United States will face three bad choices. First, Washington could pour even more arms into Ukraine in hopes of concentrating Putin's mind; but he can easily provide additional firepower to the Donbas insurgents. Second, it could deepen its military involvement by sending American military advisers, or even troops, to the frontline to bolster the Ukrainian army; but then Russia could call America's bluff. Third, the United States could decide not to respond to Russia's escalation given the geographical disadvantage and the limited strategic interests at stake. That would amount to backing down, abandoning Ukraine, and shredding the oft-repeated argument that American and European security hinges on the outcome of the Donbas war.

2AC – Answers to Ukraine Crisis Harms Frontline #2: Democracy Turn

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

Tisdall 2018 [Simon Tisdall, a foreign affairs commentator, 8-1-2018, "American democracy is in crisis, and not just because of Trump," Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/aug/07/american-democracy-crisis-trump-supreme-court> MYY]

Trump's maverick behaviour highlights these entrenched structural problems. Yet, that aside, his rogue presidency is uniquely corrosive, right now, of democracy everywhere. His encouragement of ultranationalist, racist and neo-fascist forces from Warsaw to Charlottesville, divisive demagoguery, relentless vilification of independent journalism, contempt for the western European democracies, coddling of dictators and rejection of the established, rules-based international order all reinforce perceptions that the global role of the US as shining democratic beacon is dimming rapidly. Trump did this all by himself.

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

Larison 2012 [Daniel Larison, 4-11-2012, "The enduring failure of democracy promotion abroad," The Week, <http://theweek.com/articles/476535/enduring-failure-democracy-promotion-abroad> MYY]

Since the end of the Cold War, democracy promotion has been one of the default elements of U.S. foreign policy. Spreading democracy became a particularly important part of the Bush administration's rhetoric in support of its so-called "freedom agenda," which was at the same time far more selective and inconsistent than its universalistic assumptions would suggest. And since the beginning of popular uprisings in North Africa and the Near East last year, democracy promotion has also figured more prominently in the public rhetoric and policies of the Obama administration. But let's face it: While there may be exceptions, democracy promotion during the last decade has generally produced dismal results for the nations affected by it. It is easy enough to point to well-known examples in which the "freedom agenda" immediately backfired: In places like Iraq, Lebanon, and Gaza, democracy-hocking meddlers empowered sectarian parties, militias, and terrorist groups. However, that doesn't fully account for its failure. The best way to appreciate the failure of U.S.-led democracy promotion over the last 10 years is to look closely at its supposed success stories in Georgia and Libya. Georgia was the first former Soviet republic to experience a "color" revolution in 2003, which brought President Mikheil Saakashvili to power the following year. Hailed by President Bush as a great democratic reformer intent on aligning his country with the U.S. and the West, Saakashvili steadily concentrated power in his hands over the last eight years and created a one-party state. Saakashvili became a symbol of the imagined success of the "freedom agenda." But as so often happened under Bush, the Georgian government was embraced as a democracy because of its pro-Western orientation, and not because of its political reforms. According to the most recent Freedom House report, Georgia is still not considered an electoral democracy, and last year the country received lower ratings on the protection of political rights and civil liberties than it did when Saakashvili's predecessor was still in power. Despite all of this, U.S. support for Georgia continues, based on the illusion that this is an expression of solidarity for a small democratic state. This mostly uncritical American support for the Georgian government has contributed to the deterioration in Georgia by making it easier for Saakashvili and his party to consolidate power. The Georgian government has also been accused by Amnesty International of using official investigations to intimidate members of the main opposition group created and supported by the billionaire Bidzina Ivanishvili. Ivanishvili's Georgian citizenship was stripped last year on the technicality that he held two foreign passports. The reality is that he was deprived of his citizenship to block him from running for office by a government that perceives him as a potential threat to the ruling United National Movement's hold on the presidency. And consider Libya. Western intervention was not justified primarily in terms of democracy promotion, but one of the main arguments for U.S. involvement was that the failure of the Libyan uprising would demoralize protest movements throughout the region. Supporting the "Arab Spring" directly informed the decision to support regime change in Libya. As it turned out, this also led Western governments to back a non-transparent, unaccountable council made up mostly of exiles as the legitimate national government, which is currently as ineffectual as it is undemocratic.

1NC – Ukraine Crisis

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.

Bloomberg 2018

[Editorial Board, 11-28-2018, "Russia's Latest Aggression Demands a Response," Bloomberg, <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2018-11-28/russia-s-latest-aggression-against-ukraine-demands-a-response> MYY]

The latest crisis involving Russian aggression - the seizure of three Ukrainian naval ships and 24 sailors in the Sea of Azov - is classic Vladimir Putin. With his popularity at home collapsing almost as quickly as the price of the oil that keeps Russia's economy afloat, an international incident that the Russian propaganda machine can blame on the enemy is just what he needed. One question now is whether he will take this further, using more hybrid warfare to destabilize Ukraine, ramp up his proxy war in the nation's east, or try another land grab, as he did in Crimea four years ago. Another question is what, if anything, the West will do to dissuade him. So far, Europe and the U.S. seem inclined to do little. An emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council went nowhere. The European Union is preoccupied with Brexit and other internal matters. The U.S. condemned Russia's actions, but without much conviction. The naval incident was predictable. Despite a 2003 bilateral agreement to share the Sea of Azov (to the northeast of the Black Sea), Russia claims much of it as territorial waters. By taking Crimea, it was able to build a bridge across the strait separating that peninsula from the Russian mainland. This lets it harass ships and block the Ukrainian ports that export agricultural goods and metal ores, without which Kiev's economy would crumble. Europe and the U.S. should insist that the Ukrainian ships and sailors be turned over immediately, and that Russia give up its illegal maritime claims. The message can be driven home in person at the G-20 meeting in Argentina this weekend. If Moscow refuses, there are options. The U.S. and Europe could step up sanctions on Russian individuals and companies. (This is no pointless gesture: Sanctions to date have been far more biting than most people realize.) Germany could help by canceling the planned Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline from Russia - something it should have done already. The U.S. approved shipping sophisticated "lethal defensive" armaments such as antitank weapons to Ukraine a year ago, but could put a new emphasis on arming and training the nation's small navy, which lost its headquarters in Crimea in the Russian invasion. And NATO, which wisely included Ukraine in a large military exercise in September, needs to bolster its presence across the entire Black Sea to counter Russia's huge naval buildup. The U.S. Congress, which strongly supports Ukraine, should ensure that Trump doesn't let it become a bargaining chip in negotiations with Putin over unrelated issues such as the Syrian war or nuclear nonproliferation agreements. To encourage this support, Ukraine needs to act as well. Barring an actual Russian invasion, its parliament should lift the martial-law powers given to President Petro Poroshenko on Tuesday. Otherwise, the country's unpopular leader may could conceivably act to postpone next year's national election. The government also needs to grapple more effectively with endemic corruption. A well-governed Ukraine can ask more of its reluctant allies. Regardless, the West should respond. If it chooses to let this go, Putin will be emboldened to push his aggressions not just in Ukraine but along his entire European border and beyond.

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

McFaul 2018

[Michael McFaul is Director Of The Freeman Spogli Institute For International Studies At Stanford University, 2018, "Russia as It Is," Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russia-fsu/2018-06-14/russia-it-myy>]

No theater in the fight to contain Russia is more important than Ukraine. Building a secure, wealthy, democratic Ukraine, even if parts of the country remain under Russian occupation for a long time, is the best way to restrain Russian ideological and military aggression in Europe. A failed state in Ukraine will confirm Putin's flawed hypothesis about the shortcomings of U.S.-sponsored democratic revolutions. A successful democracy in Ukraine is also the best means for inspiring democratic reformers inside Russia and other former Soviet republics. The United States must increase its military, political, and economic support for Ukraine. Washington should also impose new sanctions on Russians involved in violating Ukraine's sovereignty and ratchet them up until Putin begins to withdraw.

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

Kagan 2017

[ROBERT KAGAN, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and the author of *The World America Made*, "Backing Into World War III" *Foreign Policy* (6 February 2017) <http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/02/06/backing-into-world-war-iii-russia-china-trump-obama/> MYY]

Granting the revisionist powers spheres of influence is not a recipe for peace and tranquility but rather an invitation to inevitable conflict. Russia's historical sphere of influence does not end in Ukraine. It begins in Ukraine. It extends to the Baltic States, to the Balkans, and to the heart of Central Europe. And within Russia's traditional sphere of influence, other nations do not enjoy autonomy or even sovereignty. There was no independent Poland under the Russian Empire nor under the Soviet Union. For China to gain its desired sphere of influence in East Asia will mean that, when it chooses, it can close the region off to the United States — not only militarily but politically and economically, too. China will, of course, inevitably exercise great sway in its own region, as will Russia. The United States cannot and should not prevent China from being an economic powerhouse. Nor should it wish for the collapse of Russia. The United States should even welcome competition of a certain kind. Great powers compete across multiple planes — economic, ideological, and political, as well as military. Competition in most spheres is necessary and even healthy. Within the liberal order, China can compete economically and successfully with the United States; Russia can thrive in the international economic order upheld by the democratic system, even if it is not itself democratic. But military and strategic competition is different. The security situation undergirds everything else. It remains true today as it has since World War II that only the United States has the capacity and the unique geographical advantages to provide global security and relative stability. There is no stable balance of power in Europe or Asia without the United States. And while we can talk about "soft power" and "smart power," they have been and always will be of limited value when confronting raw military power. Despite all of the loose talk of American decline, it is in the military realm where U.S. advantages remain clearest. Even in other great powers' backyards, the United States retains the capacity, along with its powerful allies, to deter challenges to the security order. But without a U.S. willingness to maintain the balance in far-flung regions of the world, the system will buckle under the unrestrained military competition of regional powers. Part of that willingness entails defense spending commensurate with America's continuing global role. For the United States to accept a return to spheres of influence would not calm the international waters. It would merely return the world to the condition it was in at the end of the 19th century, with competing great powers clashing over inevitably intersecting and overlapping spheres. These unsettled, disordered conditions produced the fertile ground for the two destructive world wars of the first half of the 20th century. The collapse of the British-dominated world order on the oceans, the disruption of the uneasy balance of power on the European continent as

a powerful unified Germany took shape, and the rise of Japanese power in East Asia all contributed to a highly competitive international environment in which dissatisfied great powers took the opportunity to pursue their ambitions in the absence of any power or group of powers to unite in checking them. The result was an unprecedented global calamity and death on an epic scale. It has been the great accomplishment of the U.S.-led world order in the 70 years since the end of World War II that this kind of competition has been held in check and great power conflicts have been avoided. It will be more than a shame if Americans were to destroy what they created — and not because it was no longer possible to sustain but simply because they chose to stop trying.

2. Democracy turn – US support for Ukraine through arms sales demonstrates support for democracy. Green 2018

[Lloyd Green, an attorney in New York, was staff secretary to George H.W. Bush's 1988 campaign's Middle East Policy Group and served in the Department of Justice from 1990 to 1992, 7-12-2018, "Mr. President, Don't Abandon Ukraine," Real Clear Politics, https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2018/07/12/mr_president_dont_abandon_ukraine_137493.html MYY]

Yet Russia persists in its efforts to destabilize Ukraine. Russia's illegal 2014 annexation of Crimea was not an isolated event. Despite a formal ceasefire, Russian-backed separatists are engaged in military conflict to deliver eastern Ukraine into Moscow's hands. Fortunately, the Trump administration has provided weapons, training and encouragement to Kiev, and Congress has imposed heightened sanctions against Russia. Reversing Obama administration policy, the Trump administration approved sales to Ukraine of defensive weapons such as Javelin missile systems and anti-sniper systems last December and again in March. Anti-tank missiles and rifles won't halt a Russian invasion, but they will make the Kremlin and its friends think twice about the costs of another land grab. As Secretary of Defense James Mattis put it: "What we want is the same thing the United States has stood for, for a long time in our history. That is an independent, sovereign Ukraine." Striking a similar chord, the State Department earlier this year commemorated Ukraine's February 2014 "Revolution of Dignity." Back then, Ukrainians converged on Maidan Nezalezhnosti, Kiev's central square, demanding that their government "recognize the choice" of the citizens of Ukraine and "join Europe." They also forced their Russophile prime minister out of office. And yes things have improved. In 2014, Freedom House noted a marked deterioration of freedom in a Russian-dominated Ukraine. Now, Freedom House reports that Ukraine has "made progress in crafting and implementing a number of reforms." Still, Russia's conduct remains defiant. Last week, a story emerged of a British couple apparently poisoned by the same Russian nerve agent that months ago sent former Russian spy Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia to an English hospital. One of the recent victims died on Sunday. And in case anyone forgot, in July 2014 Russian missiles were used to shoot down a Malaysian Airlines flight over Ukrainian airspace, killing all 298 passengers. A report issued in May 2018 by the Austrian and Dutch governments placed the blame on a Russian anti-aircraft rocket brigade that fired from Russian soil. Against this backdrop, U.S. diplomatic and military assistance to Ukraine should be continued because it sends a clear reminder that America supports democracy at home and abroad. To be sure, Ukraine has not looked for a free lunch. In addition to suffering 10,000 deaths and the displacement of 1.6 million people, Ukraine has put its money where its mouth is. Over the past few years, Ukraine's defense spending has moved upward, from 3.2 percent of GDP to more than 6 percent. In 2018, Ukraine has increased defense spending by more than a quarter. In comparison, the U.S. expends 4.5 percent of GDP on defense, while Russia and Israel each spend more than 5 percent on their respective militaries. Indeed, outside of the U.S., Greece, Britain and Estonia are the only NATO members that meet the alliance's 2 percent guideline on defense outlays. By every metric, Ukraine is more than pulling its weight. In addition, Ukraine recently adopted its national security law, which sets out Ukraine's national interests and strives for integration with the West. Among other things, the law provides for civilian control over the military, mandates that a minimum of 5 percent of GDP be directed toward defense annually, and gives the government greater control over military exports. Last year, the Trump administration tamped down on U.S. travel and business with Cuba. Yet there are those in Congress who would incomprehensibly loosen up on Russia, despite its repeated failure to respect its neighbor's territorial integrity. Indeed, Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin announced new U.S. sanctions against Russia just four months ago. How these contradictory impulses can be squared is difficult to understand. Fortunately, on Friday the State Department reiterated its commitment to Ukraine, saying that the U.S.

"stands ready to continue supporting Ukraine's defense and security sector reforms to bolster Ukraine's ability to defend its territorial integrity." Clearly, this is no time for America to go wobbly.

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

Abrams 2016

[Elliott Abrams, Former Assistant Secretary Of State For Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs and over a dozen other foreign policy folks, 3-16-2016, "U.S. Must Put Democracy at the Center of its Foreign Policy," Foreign Policy, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/03/16/the-u-s-must-put-democracy-at-the-center-of-its-foreign-policy/> MYY]

In recent years, authoritarian regimes such as Russia and China have become more repressive; they see the advance of democracy not only within their borders but in neighboring states as a threat to their monopoly on political power. A regime's treatment of its own people often indicates how it will behave toward its neighbors and beyond. Thus, we should not be surprised that so many of the political, economic and security challenges we face emanate from places like Moscow, Beijing, Pyongyang, Tehran, and Damascus. Repressive regimes are inherently unstable and must rely on suppressing democratic movements and civil society to stay in power. They also are the source and exporter of massive corruption, a pervasive transnational danger to stable democratic governance throughout the world. The result is that democracy is under attack. According to Freedom House, freedom around the world has declined every year for the past decade. That heightens the imperative for the United States to work with fellow democracies to reinvigorate support for democratic reformers everywhere. Supporting freedom around the world does not mean imposing American values or staging military interventions. In non-democratic countries, it means peacefully and creatively aiding local activists who seek democratic reform and look to the United States for moral, political, diplomatic, and sometimes material support. These activists often risk prison, torture, and death struggling for a more democratic society, and their resilience and courage amid such threats demand our support. Helping them upholds the principles upon which our country was founded. Supporting democracy involves partnerships between the U.S. government and non-governmental organizations that are struggling to bring freedom to their countries. Often, it means partnering as well with emerging democracies to strengthen their representative and judicial institutions. This requires resources that Congress must continue to provide, and foreign assistance must be linked to positive performance with regard to human rights and the advancement of fundamental freedoms. It also requires diplomatic backing at the highest levels of the Executive Branch, throughout the different agencies of government, and from the Congress as well. It means meeting with democratic activists from various parts of the world and speaking out on their behalf. Demonstrating solidarity with and support for these brave individuals' efforts to build a better future for their country is the right thing to do. In aiding their struggles for freedom and justice, we build a more secure world for the United States. There is no cookie-cutter approach to supporting democracy and human rights, but there are fundamental, universal features we should emphasize: representative institutions, rule of law, accountability, free elections, anti-corruption, free media (including the Internet), vibrant civil society, independent trade unions, property rights, open markets, women's and minority rights, and freedoms of expression, assembly, association, and religion. Many Americans question why the United States should have to shoulder the burdens of supporting freedom and democracy throughout the world. But a growing number of democracies in Europe and Asia, as well as international organizations, are expending significant resources to lend this kind of assistance. We should continue to build on our partnerships with like-minded organizations and countries, including relatively new democracies that are eager to help others striving for freedom. Some argue that we can pursue either our democratic ideals or our national security, but not both. This is a false choice. We recognize that we have other interests in the economic, energy, and security realms with other countries and that democracy and human

CDL Teachers' Manual
2019-2020

rights cannot be the only items on the foreign policy agenda. But all too often, these issues get shortchanged or dropped entirely in order to smooth bilateral relationships in the short run. The instability that has characterized the Middle East for decades is the direct result of generations of authoritarian repression, the lack of accountable government, and the repression of civil society, not the demands that we witnessed during the Arab Spring of 2011 and since for dignity and respect for basic human rights. In the longer run, we pay the price in instability and conflict when corrupt, autocratic regimes collapse. Our request is that you elevate democracy and human rights to a prominent place on your foreign policy agenda. These are challenging times for freedom in many respects, as countries struggle to make democracy work and powerful autocracies brutalize their own citizens while undermining their neighbors. But these autocracies are also vulnerable. Around the world, ordinary people continue to show their preference for participatory democracy and accountable government. Thus, there is real potential to renew global democratic progress. For that to happen, the United States must exercise leadership, in league with our democratic allies, to support homegrown efforts to make societies freer and governments more democratic. We ask you to commit to providing that leadership and to embracing the cause of democracy and human rights if elected president of the United States.

2NC/1NR Block: Ukraine Crisis (Arms sales good and democracy turns)

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.
Chalfant 2018

[Morgan Chalfant, 11-29-2018, "Trump confronts new Russia test with Ukraine crisis," TheHill, <https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/418982-trump-confronts-new-russia-test-with-ukraine-crisis> MYY]

Russia's seizure of three Ukrainian ships has served up a new test for President Trump. The issue is looming over the Group of 20 (G-20) summit this weekend in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where Trump will be under pressure to deliver a firm response to Moscow. Trump on Thursday canceled a one-on-one meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin because "ships and sailors have not been returned to Ukraine from Russia." The incident off the coast of Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula further complicates Trump's effort to repair relations with Moscow at a time of near peak tensions, following Russia's effort to meddle in the 2016 presidential election. Ukraine accused Russia on Sunday of ramming one of its boats and opening fire on and capturing three vessels and 24 crewmembers off the coast of Crimea, which Russia annexed in 2014 to international condemnation. Russia's federal security service, the FSB, said the boats were operating unlawfully in its territorial waters and Moscow has since jailed the sailors. Ukraine has also accused Moscow of a de facto blockade on two of its major ports in the Azov Sea. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley and Secretary of State Mike Pompeo both decried Russia's actions as a violation of international law. Trump himself has remained relatively quiet on the issue, telling The Washington Post in an interview Tuesday that he didn't like "that aggression" and suggesting he could cancel the Putin meeting before pivoting to a discussion about insufficient spending by NATO partners. Trump's decision to cancel the meeting is welcome news to those who argued it would send the wrong message given Moscow's latest behavior. Still, some are demanding that Trump take further steps. Sen. Bob Menendez (D-N.J.) has called on the administration to boost security aid to Ukraine, including by sending lethal maritime equipment to Kiev. Some have also suggested the U.S. and other European partners increase their naval presence in the Black Sea to conduct patrols or routine training exercises. Others have suggested additional sanctions could be leveled to further squeeze Moscow. "It's really important that the United States takes a firm stance," said Evelyn Farkas, who served as deputy assistant secretary of defense for Russia, Ukraine and Eurasia during the Obama administration.

CDL Teachers' Manual 2019-2020

"These types of strong men, they only stop when they are forced to, when the international community says this is unacceptable and you have to stop and make the price they have to pay too high," said Farkas, now a senior fellow at the German Marshall Fund. Trump will have a platform at the G-20 to call Russia out for its behavior. "We want the administration, our allies to really press Russia on this. This is completely unacceptable and should be condemned," Sen. Ron Johnson (R-Wis.) said. "We need to really react to this with strength and resolve or Putin will keep pushing." The Ukraine issue is one that also plagued the Obama administration, which was first to grapple with Russia's annexation of Crimea. Some criticized former President Obama for being reluctant to send lethal defensive aid to Ukraine, which Trump has done. "The big challenge is to send a clear signal to the Russian federation that this kind of aggression has a red line. This is not something that the previous administration, the Obama administration, did effectively," said Alina Polyakova, a foreign policy expert at the Brookings Institution. "This is an opportunity for this administration to send a clear message by taking specific actions, whether it be more broad, painful economic sanctions, where it be sending U.S. vessels into the Black Sea." Tensions have simmered in the region for four years, but the encounter at sea represents an escalation that experts say could worsen if left unchecked by the U.S. and other western powers.

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

Wright 2015

[Thomas Wright, fellow and director of the Project on International Order and Strategy at the Brookings Institution, 4-27-2015, "China and Russia vs. America: Great-Power Revisionism Is Back," National Interest, <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/china-russia-vs-america-great-power-revisionism-back-12733?page=0%2C1> MYY]

If accommodation remains undesirable, how should the United States and its allies deter modern revisionism? As long as revisionist states carefully choose their targets and means, there is no easy answer to the problem we face. It is simply not realistic to threaten war over each and every revisionist act for the aforementioned reasons. However, there are steps the United States can take. The first is to describe revisionist acts for what they are. We should not downplay or seek to move on from territorial aggression. We must explain why it is an egregious violation of the international order, even where "nonvital" interests are concerned. The second is to strengthen deterrence by denial. The United States should build defense capacity in vulnerable states and limit the offensive capabilities of revisionists, including training and equipping other countries to deal with unconventional warfare. The third is to strengthen the regional and global order by making opposition to territorial expansion a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy and by developing legal and diplomatic paths to counter it. In a practical sense, this means pressuring European nations to back the Philippines right to take a case against China over the South China Sea dispute and pressuring the BRICS to condemn Russia's annexation of Crimea.

7. They say deterrence fails, but deterrence succeeds.

Fried & Simakovsky 2018

[Daniel Fried A Distinguished Senior Fellow At The Atlantic Council's Future Europe Initiative and Eurasia Center, Is A Former U.S. Ambassador To Poland., Mark Simakovsky, a nonresident senior fellow at the Atlantic Council's Eurasia Center, was Russia policy director at the Defense Department during the 2014 Russian invasion of Ukraine and a Pentagon adviser during Russia's 2008 invasion of Georgia., 8-8-2018, "Russia invaded Georgia exactly 10 years ago. Here's how Trump could prevent another war.," USA TODAY, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2018/08/08/trump-putin-russia-lessons-prevent-war-georgia-ukraine-column/926081002/> MYY]

Putin believes that attempts to hold Russia accountable are flagging and will ultimately fail. The West's challenge is to prove him wrong — a task complicated by President Donald Trump's pursuit of his own unique "reset" with Moscow that involves fueling trans-Atlantic differences on Russia. It's not at all clear Trump is interested in

CDL Teachers' Manual
2019-2020

learning from the past. But if he is, here are five lessons that could help prevent a third, and possibly worse, war. Don't underestimate Russian ambitions ► Prepare for both conventional and unconventional Russian maneuvers, no matter how unlikely they appear. The 2008 Russo-Georgian war surprised many U.S. officials and left the U.S. government reeling. It should not have. The fall of the Soviet Union had lulled the U.S. into a belief in Russian self-limitation, and the West fell victim to a lack of imagination. Officials in the Defense Department were warned of the need to conduct higher level contingency planning months before the crisis, to no avail. Despite the warning lights flashing in Georgia for months, including Russian railway troop movements inside Abkhazia in May 2008, the administration was unprepared to respond in August to a war in the South Caucasus. ► Western divisions can suggest to Russia that it has an opportunity for aggression with impunity. Western division over Georgia — on display at the Bucharest NATO Summit in April 2008, when the U.S. and Germany squared off about whether to offer a Membership Action Plan for Georgia and Ukraine — may have contributed to Putin's conclusion that he could attack Georgia without consequence. The Bucharest Summit settled on compromise language that Georgia and Ukraine would one day become NATO members, but this forward-looking objective on top of public differences over a first step toward NATO may have infuriated Putin while also signaling Western ambivalence. ► Western and U.S. counter-pressure during a conflict can limit Russian aggression. Russian military forces turned back from Tbilisi, partially because of late but effective U.S. resolve that included flying Georgian soldiers directly back to Georgia from Iraq, despite Russian warnings. This demonstrated Bush's determination that the U.S. would not stand idle as Russia tried to destroy Georgia. Ukrainians resisted Russian attacks in the Donbas, and the West, led by President Barack Obama and German Chancellor Angela Merkel, imposed sanctions on Russia. In both cases, partly in response to this counter-pressure, the Russians stopped their military advance but held on to their gains. ► The wider American interest to improve U.S.-Russia ties sidelined attempts to build a concerted and lasting international response to the 2008 war. The Obama administration "reset" with Russia, which sought to use an improvement in U.S.-Russian ties to achieve American aims in Afghanistan, Iran, North Korea and on nuclear arms limitations, ended what was a limited array of isolation measures engineered against Moscow after the 2008 Russo-Georgian war. The "reset" suggested that the West's collective memory was short, and that Americans would overlook Russian aggression by prioritizing pursuing shared interests with Moscow. The Obama administration deliberately kept its distance from Georgia, limiting relations, including arms sales, suggesting to Moscow that its war against Georgia didn't count in the larger context of U.S.-Russia relations. ► As confirmed in the 2014 Russian invasion of Ukraine, Russia will allow its former Soviet neighbors to exercise some domestic autonomy but bound to the Russian yoke. Some in the West are attracted to a frank sphere-of-influence division of the world, seeing it as inevitable, even stabilizing. But such arrangements are not stabilizing. Nations consigned to a Russian sphere of influence will, in practice, live in poorer and more corrupt conditions than they would in a closer association with the West. Should countries try to escape Russian control, as the Georgians and Ukrainians discovered in their respective pro-Western "Rose Revolution" and "Revolution of Dignity," they are subject to punishment or invasion.

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. Inhofe 2019

[Sen. Jim Inhofe, 4-4-2019, "U.S. Has Done Much to Help Ukraine, But It Can Do More," POLITICO Magazine, <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2019/04/04/us-russia-navy-ukraine-putin-226538> MYY]

Most of all, the United States should develop a long-term plan for security assistance to Ukraine — a plan that truly reflects the stakes of this conflict not just for Ukraine, but for the United States. Last year, Ukraine received its first lethal aid from the United States thanks to the Trump administration’s approval of a sale of Javelin anti-tank missiles — a critical step the Obama administration refused to take despite bipartisan support in Congress. The Trump administration also notified Congress in February that, for the first time since its creation in 2015, funds for the Department of Defense’s Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative will be used to provide lethal aid, including sniper rifles and shoulder-fired grenade launchers. I commend the administration for these two “firsts.” Now it’s time to increase funding for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, as well as the State Department’s security assistance programs. And a larger share of this funding should go to support defensive lethal aid that will make Ukraine a more difficult target for Putin’s aggression. After Putin’s Black Sea attack, Ukraine’s maritime capabilities must be enhanced by accelerating acquisition of coastal defense radars, patrol boats, coastal defense and anti-ship missiles and other systems. On the ground, Ukraine needs more Javelins, other anti-tank weapons, electronic warfare systems and advanced counterartillery radars. And in the air, we should examine how to assist Ukraine in improving its air defenses. Of course, the response of the free world to Putin’s aggression is not the responsibility of the United States alone. Canada, Lithuania, Poland and the United Kingdom have been providing security resources to Ukraine. We need more allies and partners to step up with action rather than talk. Our European allies and partners should ban all Russian Navy vessels from their ports. Many of these ships home-port in illegally annexed Ukrainian territory. These ships fire missiles into Syria to keep the murderer Bashar Assad in power. Putin’s warships do not belong in the ports of the free world. And until Ukraine’s sailors and ships are returned, our European allies should extend that ban to Russian commercial ships originating from the Black Sea. Perhaps the most powerful step our European partners could take would be to cancel the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, which will strengthen Russia’s grip on the European energy market and place Ukraine’s economic and physical security at greater risk. I hope this project will be stopped, but in the meantime, I urge European leaders to strictly apply European energy law to the pipeline, insist on greater transparency and demand the operation of the pipeline be truly independent of Gazprom, Putin’s corrupt gas syndicate. The Ukrainian people further turned their backs to Russia in their elections this past weekend, resoundingly rejecting the only candidate supporting a closer relationship with Putin. But the

country can also do more to strengthen its own defense against Russian aggression and malign influence by staying on the path of reform and cleaning up corruption. Nothing, however, can diminish the sacrifices made by the people of Ukraine, nor the extraordinary courage and resolve they have shown through five difficult years of war. Ukrainians are fighting, as the beloved Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko once put it, to join "the family of the free." In this fight, Ukraine needs and deserves our help.

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

Schoen 2019

[Douglas E. Schoen, served as a pollster for President Clinton. A longtime political consultant, he is a Fox News contributor, 3-17-2019, "As global order collapses, American leadership is critical," TheHill, <https://thehill.com/opinion/international/434411-as-global-order-collapses-american-leadership-is-critical> MYY]

Indeed, the United States should embrace an approach of "assertive democratic idealism," by which I mean that the U.S. can and should look out for its own interests while continuing to serve as the world's standard-bearer of democracy. I believe that any hopes for a more stable international climate can only come to fruition if the U.S. pursues such a strategy — not the isolationism that President Trump champions, nor the uncritical internationalism that was, in different ways, the downfall of both President George W. Bush's and President Barack Obama's foreign policy. Rather, I see the U.S. as making necessary adjustments as needed to protect its national interests but also not abandoning the global leadership role that only we can play, including standing up for our allies and championing human rights and democracy around the world. In our volatile modern world, the only true prospect for stabilizing the global climate will come from a renewed commitment to leadership from the United States that is informed by an idealistic, moral, yet practical outlook toward the rest of the world.

TOPICALITY 1NC vs. Taiwan

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

1. "Substantial" must be at least 2%

Words & Phrases 1960

'Substantial' means "of real worth and importance; of considerable value; valuable." Bequest to charitable institution, making 1/48 of expenditures in state, held exempt from taxation; such expenditures constituting "substantial" part of its activities. Tax Commission of Ohio v. American Humane Education Soc., 181 N.E. 557, 42 Ohio App. 4.

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

Macdonald 2018

[Andrew Macdonald, London, 11-9-2018, "Total US defence exports up 13% in 2018," Janes 360, <https://www.janes.com/article/84492/total-us-defence-exports-up-13-in-2018> MYY]

The US State Department released new figures detailing the country's defence exports made under privately contracted Direct Commercial Sales (DCS) on 8 November, revealing a 6.6% increase year on year. Total DSC transfers in 2018 were USD136.6 billion, up from USD128.1 billion in 2017. Combined with US government-to-government Foreign Military Sales (FMS), details of which were published on 9 October, the DCS deliveries take total US defence exports in 2018 to USD192.3 billion, a 13% rise compared with 2017.

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

Frolich, March 2019

[Thomas C. Frohlich, 3-26-2019, "Saudi Arabia buys the most weapons from the US government. See what other countries top list.," USA TODAY, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2019/03/26/us-arms-sales-these-countries-buy-most-weapons-government/39208809/> MYY]

10. Taiwan • Arms imports from US, 2008-2018: \$3.58 billion, 95.1 percent of arms imports • Arms imports from US, 2018: \$129 million, 100 percent of arms imports • 1st, 2nd, and 3rd largest suppliers (2014-2018): USA, Germany, Italy • GDP per capita: \$00

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 – 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.

2AC – Answer 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.

Mehta 2018

[Aaron Mehta, 10-9-2018, "America sold \$55.6 billion in weapons abroad in FY18 — a 33 percent jump," Defense News, <https://www.defensenews.com/digital-show-dailies/ausa/2018/10/09/america-sold-556-billion-in-weapons-abroad-in-fy18/> MUU]

The U.S. inked \$55.6 billion in foreign military sales during fiscal year 2018, easily smashing past the previous year's total — and the Pentagon's point man for security cooperation expects more in the future.

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

Defense Security Cooperation Agency 2019

[Defense Security Cooperation Agency, 8-20-2019, "Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (TECRO) – F-16C/D Block 70 Aircraft and Related Equipment and Support," <https://www.dsca.mil/major-arms-sales/taipei-economic-and-cultural-representative-office-united-states-tecro-f-16cd-block> MYY]

The State Department has made a determination approving a possible Foreign Military Sale to TECRO for the 66 F-16C/D Block 70 aircraft and related equipment and support for an estimated cost of \$8 billion. The Defense Security Cooperation Agency delivered the required certification notifying Congress of this possible sale today.

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

Words and Phrases 2002 (Volume 40A, p. 458)

D.S.C. 1966. The word "substantial" within Civil Rights Act providing that a place is a public accommodation if a "substantial" portion of food which is served has moved in commerce must be construed in light of its usual and customary meaning, that is, something of real worth and importance; of considerable value; valuable, something worthwhile as distinguished from something without value or merely nominal

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.

1AR – TOPICALITY = Substantial

- A. Extend our Mehta 2018 and DSCA 2019 evidence, we meet their interpretation; we stop a significant amount of arms sales to Taiwan.
- B. Extend our counter interpretation – the aff must defend reducing arms sales by a considerable amount. You should prefer our evidence because

- C. Extend our limits arguments - the neg has a significant number of counterplans (ex. Consult and conditions CP) they can run
- D. Extend our education arguments - our interpretation allows debates on many affirmatives including Saudi Arabia, Mexico, Taiwan, Ukraine, etc. which are important countries on the topic of US arms sales. We allow for the most education in the round under our interpretation.
- E. Topicality is not a voter

Name of Argument Ukraine Crisis



IAC (8 minutes)	INC (8 minutes)	2AC (8 minutes)	2NC/1NR 8 min + 5 min	1AR (5 minutes)	2NR (5 minutes)	2AR (5 minutes)
<p>Trump: ↑ Arms sales to UKR</p> <p>Somchuk 19</p>	<p>→ Arms sales good</p> <p>1. Putin's popularity</p> <p>→ low arms sales</p> <p>↳ & war</p> <p>Bloomberg 18</p> <p>2. Ukraine: ↳ containment</p> <p>arms sales ↳</p> <p>McFaul 18</p>	<p>→ ext. Carpenter 18</p> <p>⊙ ⊙ Russia's Perceptions - weapons → production</p> <p>Wainer 19</p> <p>Arms UKR</p> <p>↳ deter Rus → escalation</p> <p>Cohen 15</p> <p>Arms → conflict escalation</p> <p>Memon + Rizer 17</p> <p>at dem. turn</p> <p>1. NU: Trump erodes dem.</p> <p>Tisdall 18</p> <p>2. dem. promotion fails</p> <p>Larson 12</p>	<p>→ ext. Bloomberg 18</p> <p>Putin → more aggressive</p> <p>→ ext. McFaul 18</p> <p>turns case</p> <p>Russia: ↳ testing the US in UKR - weakness → aggression</p> <p>Chaffant 18</p> <p>Arms sales ↳ deter</p> <p>RUS aggression</p> <p>Wright 15</p> <p>deterrence subjects</p> <p>Fried 18</p> <p>→ ext. Green 19 - dem. turn</p> <p>→ ext. Abrams 16</p> <p>Commitment to UKR shows support for dem.</p> <p>in hole 19</p> <p>US leadership in dem → ↳</p>	<p>→ ext. Wainer 19</p> <p>ar → newer than their chaffant ar.</p> <p>→ ext. Carpenter 18</p> <p>→ ↳</p> <p>US-RUS relations</p> <p>Arms sales to Ukraine → available escalation</p> <p>Chirizawa 18</p> <p>→ ext. Tisdall 18</p> <p>Trump → dem.</p> <p>Trump → global dem. ↓ - arms sales & do anything</p> <p>Abramowitz 19</p> <p>→ ext. Larson 12</p> <p>history proves dem. promotion fails</p> <p>US efforts in ME prove dem. promotion work</p> <p>Goldsmith 18</p>	<p>→ ext. Bloomberg</p> <p>McFaul - arms sales good turn</p> <p>↑/↓ now ↳</p> <p>↳ already happens (democracy)</p> <p>may great power war</p> <p>Prob. ↳ is more probable - serious democracy + increase, Russia</p> <p>US show any weakness in front of Rus</p> <p>we need to support dem. in UKR - we are a global leader</p>	<p>→ ext. Carpenter 18</p> <p>↳ arms sales → conflict</p> <p>we are seeing these issues happens now (↑/↓)</p> <p>may: nuc war gw power war</p> <p>Prob: we are seeing the ↳ now - more probable than may ↳</p> <p>ME + other countries in the global south prove US promotion of dem. never successful</p> <p>nuc war → biggest ↳ in the hand</p>

Schoen 19