

**NAUDL**



National Association for  
Urban Debate Leagues

National Association for Urban Debate Leagues

# Policy Debate Curriculum Pilot Debate 101



# National Association for Urban Debate Leagues Policy Debate Curriculum Pilot

## Unit 1: Debate 101 Preparing for the First Tournament

Time Required

12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Introduction

This unit is designed to prepare students for their first debate tournament. It covers all of the necessary components to introduce students to debate prior to their first debate rounds. At the end of this unit students will be able to:

- ⇒ Identify and discuss the parts of an argument.
- ⇒ Compare different impacts.
- ⇒ Identify the 2017-18 topic and discuss two to three different affirmative and negative strategies for that topic.
- ⇒ Construct blocks of arguments to more effectively answer arguments during Constructives.
- ⇒ Practice affirmative and negative strategies for debating the resolution.
- ⇒ Practice flowing in order to take notes in debate rounds.

If time allows many students benefit from experiencing a practice round prior to their first tournament. Allow two hours for each practice round that you schedule to ensure there is enough time for all of the speeches and feedback from judges.

Table of Contents

**Lessons**

- 2.....Why Debate?
- 3.....Toulmin’s Model of Argumentation
- 4.....Introduction to Impact Calculus
- 5.....Flowing Part 1
- 6.....Flowing Part 2
- 8.....Practice Comparing Impacts
- 9.....Structure of a Round
- 10.....Introduction to the Topic
- 11.....Affirmative Case Writing
- 12.....Negating the Affirmative
- 13.....Introduction to Disadvantages
- 14.....Introduction to Blocks
- 15.....Block Writing Workshop

**Appendix 1**

- .....Key Terms
- .....KWL
- .....Articles for Lesson 2
- .....Symbols and Abbreviations for Flowing
- .....Impact Calculus Mini Debates
- .....Theory Pentathlon Handouts

**Additional Exercises—Lessons**

- .....Cross-Ex Challenge
- .....Theory Pentathlon



Unit

1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation

Time Required

12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson

1: Why Debate

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will identify benefits to debating ideas and concepts.
- Students will discuss advocating ideas and concepts.

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- RI-2, RI-8; SL-1SL-4

Teacher Prep

- Read through core files in advance, prepare impact file, familiarize yourself with flowing activities and the Toulmin Model.
- Prepare initial meeting materials (one pagers, tournament schedules, expectations, any blanket forms).
- Map out concepts you want students to discuss during your initial conversation so it is easier to guide the conversation to those ideas.
- Split lesson between introducing necessary **paperwork/logistics** and **getting students minds activated and excited about the idea of debating**. We recommend ending with the latter so they leave excited about the journey ahead of them. This is an introduction, there is no work students need to have done in advance. If you have students who have previous debate or camp experience it may be helpful to ask them to hold off on answering while new students try their hand at it.

Resources and Materials

- Core Files 1.0
- Flowing Exercises
- Impact Calculus file
- Block Writing Template
- Toulmin Article
- Any materials locally required for activity

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min - Begin with the Essential Question on the board: “Why should we debate ideas instead of just discussing them? Students answer the question on their own in writing. They may ask for clarification about the difference between debate/discussion, or more specifics for what debate entails. It may help to define terms on the board with the question.
- ⇒ **Process 1**—20 min - Guided conversation around the benefits of debate. We want students to generate the following ideas (they may generate others as well)
  - ⇒ \*ideas get better as we criticize them and fix them
  - ⇒ \*advocating for a position is different than just talking about it.
  - ⇒ \*advocating for a position means you are more invested in learning more about it, so your ideas get better because you research and develop them
  - ⇒ \*debating requires you listen to the other side, understand that their ideas are valid, and really respond to them
  - ⇒ \*in debate we switch sides, which requires us to invest energy in understanding ideas that we may disagree with, making us more informed citizens
- ⇒ **Process 2**—5 min - wrap up, remind students about paperwork they need to turn in, upcoming obligations. Preview that in the next meeting we'll learn the basic building blocks of arguments.
- ⇒ **Process 3**—Distribute all needed league, school and district forms that they students will need to complete to participate (permission slips,

Formative Assessment

Teacher Notes



Unit 1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation  
Time Required 12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson Lesson 2: Toulmin's Model of Argumentation  
Time Required 60 minutes with 30 minutes of optional practice

Learning Goals
• Students will identify and define three basic parts of an argument.
• Students will be able to recognize and differentiate claims, warrants and impacts in basic texts.
Learning Standards
CCR Anchor Standards:
• RI-1, RI-2, RI-5, RI-8; SL-1SL-4

Teacher Prep
• Read through the Toulmin article in advance. Either read through the provided linked practice article in advance OR find an alternative article. If you choose an alternative article look for one that is the correct reading difficulty for your group. You can get a Lexile score for articles here: https://readable.io/

Resources and Materials
• Claim/Warrant/Impact handout, topic article.
• PowerPoint Slides
• https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/documents/Toulmin.pdf
• https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/quick-classroom-warm-up (pick a side, example)
• Articles in Appendix

Lesson Process
⇒ Setting the Stage—5 Min - KWL - set aside for later.
⇒ Process 1—10 min - Discussion introducing the modified Toulmin's model of argumentation: Claim (the statement you are trying to prove) Warrant (the reason that statement is true) Impact (the reason we care about that statement). After introducing the terms use examples that are relevant to the students to demonstrate what each term means.
⇒ One possibility - Claim: It is raining. Possible Warrants: 1) there is wet stuff was falling from the sky. (Mention that this is an empirical warrant, i.e., something that a person experienced.) 2) I saw the barometric pressure dropping and the humidity rising and know that that indicates it is likely raining. (Mention that this warrant is based on scientific data and expertise). Possible Implications/Impacts: 1) When I picked my shoes for this AM, I picked rainboots to keep my feet dry. 2) When I picked my shoes for this AM I didn't wear my favorite shoes because I didn't want them to be ruined by the rain. 3) I won't have soccer practice later today because the field will be wet and muddy. (Discuss how all of these can be true at the same time, and they affect different people. Some impacts affect only one person, others impact an entire team of people).
⇒ Process 2—20 min—Modified pick a side activity. Prepare 4 or 5 statements for students to agree/disagree with, use pop culture/sports references. Keep it fun. Model off the teaching channel video above, however add in time for students to defend their choices and try to persuade others with their reasons. App. 4-5 min per issue.
⇒ Process 3—Individual Practice: Using the provided article - identify the claims, warrants and impacts in the article. Practice should break down as follows (can be done independently or in groups).
⇒ 5 min - read article
⇒ 10 min - identify claims/warrants/impacts (either alone or with pairs).
⇒ 5 min - share out, discuss questions that arose.
⇒ \*Note: Students will be most tripped up by the crossover between claims/warrants in individual cards/articles. Remind them that warrants sometimes have sub-warrants called “backing” but try to get them to focus on the primary claims/warrants.

Formative Assessment
Return to KWL - Fill out what we learned. Did we answer what we wanted to know?

Teacher Notes



Unit

1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation

Time Required

12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 3: Impact Calculus and Impact Comparison

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will recall the three basic parts of an argument.
- Students will identify and compare different impact types.
- Students will identify and discuss strategies for comparing different impacts.

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- RI-1, RI-2, RI-5, RI-8; SL-1SL-4

Teacher Prep

- Familiarize yourself with the elements of risk calculus: timeframe, probability, and magnitude. Familiarize yourself with the sub-components of those elements (linear impacts, structural impacts, scope). These terms are all in the glossary of key terms in Appendix 1.

Resources and Materials

- Glossary of key terms for Lesson 3.
- Anatomy of a card slide
- Impact cards handout

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 Min - 5 - 10 min: Initial quiz and review of the parts of an argument. Use this to transition to the heart of today's focus which is impacts.
- ⇒ **Process 1**—10 min: Introduce impacts from this year's core file set including (at least): Competitiveness, Economic Decline, Genetic Diversity & Racism. It may be useful to include other impacts as well.
- ⇒ **\*Note\*** If this is the first time students are seeing carded evidence take a few minutes to explain the structure of debate evidence. See the anatomy of a card handout in the resources section. Briefly describe each argument or ask students to summarize the argument being made in the card (hint, they can do that by reading/referencing the tag). Once everyone is clear on the four different impacts being introduced transition to introducing ways to evaluate them.
- ⇒ **Process 2**—10-15 min: Acknowledge that all of these impacts are important so we need ways to tell which is more important than another in a given debate. We look at three main components of impact make up in order to do this. Introduce timeframe, probability & magnitude. Discuss concepts with examples and solicit student examples. As students give examples that introduce sub-components of impact calculus (for example, scope, or the structural nature of a problem) introduce those concepts and explain what they mean.
- ⇒ **Process 3**—15 min: Individual practice - have each student identify the timeframe/probability/magnitude of each impact, paying attention to which elements they think are strongest for each. They will want to save this work for a future activity

Formative Assessment

Sweep room to check individual responses or use it as an exit ticket

Teacher Notes



Unit

1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation

Time Required

12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 4: Flowing 101

Time Required

40 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will practice the structure of flowing.
- Students will practice identifying key words in different listening situations.

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-8, W-2, W-6, SL-1

Teacher Prep

- Flowing is a method of note taking that helps us to keep track of our arguments, our opponents arguments and how they interact throughout the round. Prior to teaching this lesson you should watch the training video "Flowing 101" at [urbandebate.org/trainings](http://urbandebate.org/trainings). It demonstrates all of the methods mentioned in this video. <<MAKE FLOWING VIDEO>>

Resources and Materials

- PowerPoints of flows, deck of cards, legal pads, two different colored pens per student
- PowerPoint slides for flowing Use the following songs, in order, when you get to flowing songs (or others that meet similar criteria for advancing through different listening situations.)
- PowerPoint slides: Flowing

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min - review components of impact calculus from yesterday.
- ⇒ **Process 1**—15 min - mini lecture introducing flowing. Key components: Flowing is a note taking system that we use to keep track of our arguments & our opponents arguments throughout the round. Everyone has a flow, each debater & the judge. This makes it possible for everyone to track the same arguments & analysis throughout the round. Use the flowing PowerPoint slide to show students what that would look like before starting some drills for them to practice.
- ⇒ **Process 2**—20-30 min - Structure exercise. Students should divide their paper into 7 columns vertically (many will want to do it horizontally, they should resist this urge, there is not enough space down the horizontal part of the paper to get through a normal debate argument). The teacher should read 6-8 "cards" down the flow. Each "card" in this instance is it's own argument. (See flowing video if you want a reminder on this portion of the exercise). Students should write each card vertically down the first column.
- ⇒ **Process 3**—Thinks to keep an eye on. 1) Students need to make sure they have enough vertical space between arguments to make sure they can line up multiple responses. Arguments should not be bunched too closely together. 2) Students will innovate and figure out ways to abbreviate the cards - that's awesome and you should highlight it. We will use similar abbreviations when we flow a debate round because it is difficult to write down every single word. We will repeat this process lining up the 1NC arguments against the 1AC, debriefing each round. There is no need to go through every single speech, 4-5 rounds should be sufficient. Be sure you:
  - ⇒ 1) Group two cards together at one point and answer them with one or more cards.
  - ⇒ 2) Drop an argument by not answering it.
  - ⇒ 3) Extend an argument that has been dropped.
  - ⇒ 4) Extend an argument that has NOT be dropped and then explain that it wasn't dropped.
- ⇒ **Process 4**—Allow time to debrief and answer questions with each round. It can be really helpful to have an older student who is a good flow in the room to provide an example of what this looks like.

Formative Assessment

Teacher Notes



Unit

1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation

Time Required

12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 4, part 2: Flowing 102

Time Required

70 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will practice the structure of flowing.
- Students will practice identifying key words in different listening situations.

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-8, W-2, W-6, SL-1

Teacher Prep

- Flowing is a method of note taking that helps us to keep track of our arguments, our opponents arguments and how they interact throughout the round. Prior to teaching this lesson you should watch the training video "Flowing 101" at [urbandebate.org/trainings](http://urbandebate.org/trainings). It demonstrates all of the methods mentioned in this video. <<MAKE FLOWING VIDEO>>

Resources and Materials

- PowerPoints of flows, computer that can play sound loud enough for all students in the room to hear, legal pads, two different colored pens per student.
- Use the following songs, in order, when you get to flowing songs (or others that meet similar criteria for advancing through different listening situations.)
- PowerPoint slides: Flowing Highwayman: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aFkcAH-m9W0>
- Trawlerman's Song: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6RKKVQkRnTU>
- Space Oddity: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iYYRH4apXDo>
- Coming Home: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HTseSi0Qgow>
- Handlebars: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HLUX0y4EptA>
- We Didn't Start the Fire: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eFTLKWw542g>

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—
- ⇒ **Process 1**—70 min - Technique exercise. Divide paper. This exercise teaches students how to pick up the key words in a large amounts of words by flowing songs. After each song debrief and discuss things that worked and things that were difficult. I recommend the following songs in order (but if you have other songs that accomplish the same things, that's totally fine). These songs are also good for this exercise because they are likely to be unfamiliar to your students. If you do trade them out, try to find things they are NOT familiar with yet.
- ⇒ 1) The Highwayman - The Highwaymen - This song is reasonably slow and chunked into 4 distinct sections without a chorus. It is easier to understand what is being said. The only difficulty this song presents is that each verse is sung by a different singer, so getting used to the new voices can be challenging for students. That's important to acknowledge because we face the same struggle with four debaters in every round.
  - ⇒ 2) The Trawlerman's Song - Mark Knopfler - This song is also reasonably slow, but less clear and many of the words will be unfamiliar to students. This is a good lesson because that will happen in debate rounds too and they need to just write as close to what they thought they heard as they did. Ask what they did with long stretches with no words or humming (many will have abbreviations there) again emphasize that abbreviations are good. (FYI - approximately the last minute of this song is instrumental, feel free to cut it shortly after minute 4).
  - ⇒ 3) Space Oddity - David Bowie - Another reasonably slow song, but much harder to understand. Bowie's accent and the tone of the song is going to make things challenging for a lot of students. Focus on clarity when reviewing this song. Try to ask questions about the substance of this song (it will be helpful for the next song).

⇒ 4) Major Tom: Coming Home - Peter Schilling - This song is faster. It will be challenging for some of the students to keep up. Circulate and encourage them to continue rather than give up. It's better that they write down a fragment here or there than that they give up. See if students piece together that this song is basically a sequel to "Space Oddity." Students may also volunteer that times like the chorus that they knew better were good chances for them to catch up on things they may have missed. This is an excellent strategy for debate rounds as well.

⇒ 5) Handlebars - Flobots - This song is difficult to flow. It would be a challenging song for many varsity debaters. Encourage students before the song begins to keep at it and to have a strategy for keeping track of missed arguments. When you have finished this song have students discuss challenges, strategies and suggestions. It is very common for students to want a second crack at this song, if time allows, absolutely go through it a second time. It will boost their confidence to see how much easier it is on the second pass.

⇒ 6) We Didn't Start the Fire - Billy Joel - This is one of the most difficult songs to flow I've ever found. It is fast and it's a list with almost no downtime in between. Many of the people/ places and things identified will be difficult to abbreviate in a way that is meaningful to the students. It is still worth trying to discuss what makes things easier to flow and what makes them harder. It's also sort of a fun way to wrap up the activity with a big challenge.

⇒ \*Note: You will want to continue to practice flowing drills throughout the year, students will not master it initially. All speaking drills and mini-debates should also be flowing exercises.

Lesson Process

Formative  
Assessment

Teacher Notes



Unit	1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation
Time Required	12 Lessons (10-15 hours)
Lesson	Lesson 5: Comparing Impacts
Time Required	120-180 minutes
Learning Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will be able to: identify the most strategic elements of impact calculus for different impacts.</li> <li>• Students will: practice comparing impacts and analyze the effectiveness of their comparisons.</li> </ul>
Learning Standards	<p>CCR Anchor Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R-3, R-8, SL-1, SL-2, SL-4, SL-6</li> </ul>
Teacher Prep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review introduction to impact calculus from lesson 1 (timeframe, probability &amp; magnitude). Review the impacts in the impact comparison file. They all come from this year's core affirmatives. Determine how much time you have (tournament/exercises)</li> <li>• Students should be familiar with the 3 elements of impact calculus (from two lessons ago). Students should be familiar with the terminal impacts of the core file affirmatives &amp; disadvantages (from two lessons ago).</li> </ul>
Resources and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact file &amp; exercises in the Appendix</li> </ul>
Lesson Process	<p>⇒ <b>Setting the Stage</b>—5 Review the three basic components of impact calculus. Review of the four impacts from Lesson 3.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 1</b>—Brief lesson (20 min) discussion: Highlight that it's very difficult/unlikely to win all three elements of impact calculus. Most impacts are very good on one or two of them and very bad on others. Use examples from core files: hegemony impact from school lunches, racism impact from desegregation. Notice that hegemony is a very large magnitude impact in terms of the scale of people who would die (nuclear war) but the timeframe and probability are uncertain because we don't know how long it would take for hegemony to collapse and result in nuclear war. It is also very unlikely that we would get all the way to the war. Alternatively, racism is happening now so the timeframe and probability are much better, however the magnitude is different. It is morally and structurally important rather than a specific instance of avoidable war.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 2</b>—Student Practice: (10 min to prepare) Pass out the Impact Calculus Mini Debate handout. Students will identify their strategy for winning impact calculus with different impacts. Followed by structured mini-debates (3 min per debate, 5 min of feedback from each debate).</p> <p>⇒ <b>Supplemental Practice</b>—If time permits, assign each student an impact and have an "impact calculus" tournament with a March Madness style bracket. Depending on the number of students this could take 1-2 hours, but allows for more in depth understanding of the concepts and allows students to practice flowing each speech and provide feedback on each debate.</p>
Formative Assessment	
Teacher Notes	



Unit	1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation
Time Required	12 Lessons (10-15 hours)
Lesson	Lesson 6: Structure of a Round
Time Required	60 minutes
Learning Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will be able to: identify the most strategic elements of impact calculus for different impacts.</li> <li>Students will: practice comparing impacts and analyze the effectiveness of their comparisons.</li> </ul>
Learning Standards	<p>CCR Anchor Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SL-1, SL-6</li> </ul>
Teacher Prep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review speech times &amp; sides in debate basics. See Appendix 1. Review the following terms - Affirmative, Negative, Reciprocity, the Negative Block, Constructive, Rebuttal, Cross-Examination, Prep Time.</li> </ul>
Resources and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PPT - Slide with speech times &amp; terms.</li> <li>Core File TE PowerPoint slides: 4-6.</li> <li>Envelopes with speeches in cut outs for students to order in small groups. (Can be cut out from printing out the debate basics page or the ppt slide)</li> </ul>
Lesson Process	<p>⇒ <b>Setting the Stage</b>—5 min - introducing the idea of reciprocity - specifically that it means similar but not exactly equal benefits. This will be important because it informs the structure of the debate round where the Affirmative gets to speak first and last and the Negative gets a large continuous block of speech time in the middle of the debate.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 1</b>—20 min - Mini Lecture about the types of speeches and their roles. Include the following: 2 person teams on each side, one person "captains" the Aff side (2A) one person captains the Neg side (2N), each person gives a constructive, a rebuttal and has a cross-examination where they ask questions and one where they answer questions. Additionally, mention the key elements of each speech (See: PowerPoint slides 7 &amp; 8) and their function.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 2</b>—20 min - Erase information from the board and have students form small groups. They are responsible for putting together the debate round, in order, with the roles and speeches. Circulate while they do this. This can be done either with them writing out the structure of the speeches and their roles OR by cutting apart each component and having them “reconstruct” the debate round by pasting the speeches back in order.</p>
Formative Assessment	10 min - Review correct answers with students. Return to key principles (What is a constructive v. a rebuttal? Why does the aff speak first and last? What is the negative block?)
Teacher Notes	



Unit	1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation
Time Required	12 Lessons (10-15 hours)
Lesson	Lesson 7: Intro to Topic Part 1
Time Required	60-120 minutes
Learning Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will discuss the 2017-18 policy resolution.</li> <li>• Students will identify the different components of the 2017-18 policy resolution.</li> </ul>
Learning Standards	<p>CCR Anchor Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R-1, R-3, R-8, SL-3, SL-2</li> </ul>
Teacher Prep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Affirmative cases.</li> </ul>
Resources and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Files 1AC (at least one, if students will be able to choose between multiple affs you may want to have all of them available. If you choose the latter route add 15-20 min per aff for this lesson)</li> </ul>
Lesson Process	<p>⇒ <b>Setting the Stage</b>—5 min - mini quiz and review speech times/roles.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 1</b>—10-20 min - Have the resolution on the board and ask the students to write it down and circle the key terms in the resolution along with an explanation for why they think they are important. Discuss the terms they believed were important and fill in the following information for them. Allow extra time for this conversation, it can take time to go reasonably in depth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ The United States federal government: this is the agent or actor of the resolution, the entity whose action we will evaluate.</li> <li>⇒ Should - This is the frame for what we are evaluating. It's an incredibly important word in the resolution. It's where we get fiat from (see Debate Basics) because it's distinct from will/would/could</li> <li>⇒ Substantially Increase - This is the action of the resolution. It tells us what direction of action the government must take. It also gives us a sense of the magnitude of change that is necessary. It cannot be small, it must be "substantial."</li> <li>⇒ Its - establishes who "owns" the regulation &amp; funding (this is important because it limits out state/local regulations and non-federal government funding)</li> <li>⇒ Regulation and/or funding - This is what must be increased by the affirmative.</li> <li>⇒ Elementary and/or secondary education - This is what must be regulated and/or funded.</li> <li>⇒ in the United States - This is the geographic limiter of where the resolutional action can take place.</li> </ul> <p>⇒ <b>Process 2</b>—15 min - Students read through 1AC to themselves. Be clear that they do NOT need to read every word (that would take much longer than 15 minutes) they should focus on the tags and highlighted words.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 3</b>—20 min - Discuss the 1AC as a group. Start with the plan and how that is a representation of the type of resolutional action the affirmative could take. Then go through each contention and discuss how it relates to the plan and the resolution. Repeat with another 1AC if there is time.</p>
Formative Assessment	
Teacher Notes	



Unit 1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation  
Time Required 12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson Lesson 8: Affirmative Case Writing  
Time Required 60 minutes

Learning Goals
• Students will identify the stock issues and label them on their affirmative cases.
• Students will evaluate the construction of a 1AC.
Learning Standards
CCR Anchor Standards:
• SL-1, SL-4

Teacher Prep
• Review Key Terms in Appendix 1 for information on the Stock Issues and Advantages.

Resources and Materials
• Core Files Affs, PowerPoints slides 8-9

Lesson Process
⇒ Setting the Stage—10 min - Mini Quiz: speech times, roles and resolution (I recommend repeating this until all of the students demonstrate they have these memorized). Review the mini quiz to ensure students recall the speech times, debate round structure and resolution.
⇒ Process 1—20 min: Mini-Lecture - The Affirmative has the burden of proof - they have to prove that the resolution is true. They do this by finding an example of the resolution (plan) that meets certain conditions we call the "stock issues." The stock issues are in slide 8. (There must be a problem (harm) it must be important (significance) the government can't be fixing your problem right now (inherency) and you have to prove that your plan solves the problem (solvency).
⇒ Process 2—Topicality is covered in a later lesson. It's different than the above stock issues because it's the only one that the affirmative doesn't have to "prove" they only need to worry about topicality if it's challenged by the negative.
⇒ \*Note: for decades debate students have been giggling about the fact that if you adjust the order of the stock issues slightly you wind up with the SHITS. Some student is going to notice this, it's actually a really helpful way for them to remember the stock issues, probably not a good thing for a teacher to volunteer though. ;)
⇒ Process 3—20 min: Group practice. Using the affirmative that your students will be reading have them label the parts of the affirmative. There are two options here - if you are going to be able to print them a clean copy of the 1AC before their first tournament they can do this on the case itself. If that isn't an option, I'd create a worksheet that has space for them to write out the components they've identified.

Formative Assessment
15 min: Each group should share what they've identified. Talk through the components of the affirmative. Wrap up.

Teacher Notes



Unit	1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation
Time Required	12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson	Lesson 9: Negating the Aff & Offense/Defense
Time Required	60 minutes

Learning Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will discuss negative strategies for answering affirmative arguments.</li> <li>Students will utilize the offense/defense paradigm to construct 4 answers to each affirmative advantage.</li> </ul>
Learning Standards	<p>CCR Anchor Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>R-1, R-3, R-8, SL-3, SL-2</li> </ul>

Teacher Prep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Key Terms in Appendix 1 for information on Negative Case Debating including: Offense, Defense, Link Turn, Impact Turn, Presumption, &amp; Status Quo.</li> </ul>
--------------	--

Resources and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Core files affirmatives &amp; negatives. Power point slide on offense/defense</li> </ul>
-------------------------	---

Lesson Process	<p>⇒ <b>Setting the Stage</b>—10 min - Mini Quiz: Include any of the following that students are still struggling with - speech times, speech types, resolution, stock issues.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 1</b>—5 min: Ask students to recall the harms and advantages from the 1AC from yesterday. List them on the board, with space next to them for possible responses. Reserve a separate space on the board for a T chart that is divided with one column labeled "defense" and one labeled "offense."</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 2</b>—10 min: Students brainstorm on their own possible answers. Have them share popcorn style. As they share, write their answer next to the advantage they are answering.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 3</b>—5 min: Introduce that arguments can function a little differently. Introduce the concepts of offense and defense (See slide 10). Defensive arguments are reasons that the aff isn't correct "You don't fix that, that's not true, that's not really that bad." Offensive arguments are reasons that arguments the affirmative have made are actually arguments for the negative "You are correct that your impact is terrible, but you make it worse (link turn), you're wrong that your impact is bad, it's actually good (impact turn)."</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 4</b>—10 min: Students categorize the arguments they made as either offense or defense.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 5</b>—10 min: Discussion - which do you think is more effective? (Answer: you need a mix of offense and defense. If you have only defense it will be difficult to win because it will be easier for the affirmative to say "you should take a chance we fix this thing and make it better." Only offense *CAN* work but it's risky because it's more persuasive to say "not only don't you cause this, you make it worse")</p> <p>⇒ <b>Supplemental Practice</b>—10 min: Bonus: At some point a student is going to ask what you do if there is a tie (if they don't ask, volunteer the situation). In the event of a tie the negative has what we call "presumption" and wins. Presumption stems from the idea that it's riskier to change the "status quo" (here and now) than it is to just stick with it. The affirmative has to prove that change is necessary. If they don't or if it's tied, the negative wins that we should stick with what we have.</p>
----------------	--

Formative Assessment	
----------------------	--

Teacher Notes	
---------------	--



Unit 1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation
Time Required 12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson Lesson 10: Introduction to DAs
Time Required 70 minutes

Learning Goals
• Students will identify the disadvantage as a negative strategy and utilize the offense/defense paradigm to analyze it.
• Students will identify the parts of a disadvantage.
Learning Standards
CCR Anchor Standards:
• R-1, R-3, R-8, SL-3, SL-2

Teacher Prep
• Review parts of a DA in Appendix 1 (Uniqueness, Links, Internal Links, Impacts). Review the DAs in the core files (racism, federalism, courts).

Resources and Materials
• Core files DAs. Power point slides 11 & 12

Lesson Process
=> Setting the Stage—Mini Quiz: Include offense/defense/link turn/impact turn from yesterday and any of the following students are still struggling with (speech times, types and the resolution, stock issues) - Note: At this point I would think speech times/types and the resolution will have dropped out. If you still have one or two students struggling with those you may want to work with them 1:1.
=> Process 1—15 min: First portion - introduce the idea that in addition to responding to arguments the affirmative has initiated, the negative can introduce their own arguments as long as they link them to the affirmative. Since these are new pieces of negative offense, we call them "off-case" positions. 10 min, review the DA Cliff slides with students, it's a helpful illustration of the parts of a DA. Feel free to tweak/make your own. I used to draw each portion piece by piece.
=> Process 2—10 min: introduce official definitions of each component of a DA. Take questions.
=> Process 3—10 min: There are 3 disadvantages we will be working with to start off with: Federalism, Courts & the Race DA (save the Racism DA until the end, it's got a slightly different model than the other two). Review one of the DAs with the group.
=> Process 4—15 min: Give students time to work in small groups to review the second DA. Identify each part and then share back with the group.
=> Process 5—15 min: Introduce the racism DA. This DA is a bit different because it is what we call a "linear" DA. That means that technically there is a uniqueness issue: Racism exists now, but the affirmative engages in it/makes it worse and we should always reject that.

Formative Assessment

Teacher Notes



Unit	1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation
Time Required	12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson	Lesson 11: Introduction to Blocks
Time Required	60 minutes

Learning Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will discuss the utility of pre-blocking arguments we can predict.</li> <li>Students will construct blocks for arguments they will encounter at their first tournaments.</li> </ul>
Learning Standards	<p>CCR Anchor Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>R-1, R-3, R-8, SL-3, SL-2</li> </ul>

Teacher Prep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pull a bank of 5-8 pieces of evidence from the file you'd like to use for block-writing. Start with the federalism DA to reinforce the DA concepts from the last lesson.</li> </ul>
--------------	--

Resources and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DA core files</li> </ul>
-------------------------	---

Lesson Process	<p>⇒ <b>Setting the Stage</b>—Mini Quiz: Review parts of a DA and the 3 DAs we went over yesterday. What makes a linear DA different? If students still need to review stock issues or the resolution, include those questions as well. Review mini-quiz and concepts.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 1</b>—15 min: Students brainstorm possible answers to the federalism DA on their own. Have them share those answers and put them on the board. As students share their answers help them classify those answers by type (for example if a student says, the affirmative doesn't change the federal government's relationship with the states, let them know that is a no link answer and label it. Continue until you have a set of 6-8 DIFFERENT arguments on the board. This will take time, students will repeat similar arguments. Here is a sample list of arguments you may have at the end:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Non-unique - the federal government is already involved in X.</li> <li>⇒ No link - the affirmative doesn't change the federal government's relationship with X.</li> <li>⇒ Link turn - the affirmative reflects the current balance of power between the state/federal government and strengthens the current relationship.</li> <li>⇒ No internal link - even if federalism is changed it doesn't effect modeling in other countries so you don't have an impact.</li> <li>⇒ No impact - federalism is not important for deterring conflict in other countries.</li> <li>⇒ Our impact outweighs - the affirmative matters more than the impact to the DA.</li> </ul> <p>⇒ <b>Process 2</b>—10 min: Explain that this is a "block" of arguments to read against the Federalism DA. Point out: 1) there are lots of different ways we've attacked the DA. 2) we have lots of different arguments we can go for. 3) We had to make a choice to EITHER link turn OR impact turn. If we did both we'd be contradicting ourselves.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 3</b>—20 min: In small groups students should match evidence to the arguments above and put them in order. Have them take a set of cut out cards and putting them in order.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 4</b>—10 min: Break up the remaining 1NC arguments and make sure we can answer them. Break students into small groups and assign each group to one of the DAs and/or Adv. They will be responsible for writing 1 block in the next session with different arguments and evidence for those arguments.</p>
----------------	--

Formative Assessment	
----------------------	--

Teacher Notes	
---------------	--



Unit	1: Debate 101, Tournament One Preparation
Time Required	12 Lessons (10-15 hours)

Lesson	Lesson 12: Block Writing Workshop
Time Required	60 minutes

Learning Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will collaborate on constructing blocks for their first tournament.</li> <li>• Students will peer edit each others blocks.</li> <li>• Students will explain their blocks to other groups.</li> </ul>
Learning Standards	<p>CCR Anchor Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R-1, R-3, R-8, SL-3, SL-2</li> </ul>

Teacher Prep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will need the files for each DA and 1AC plus the answers to those arguments. Each small group will be creating 1 block for those arguments</li> </ul>
--------------	---

Resources and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA and Affirmative Core Files</li> </ul>
-------------------------	---

Lesson Process	<p>⇒ <b>Setting the Stage</b>—Review the components of a block and why we write blocks to start this lesson.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 1</b>—30-40 min: in small groups students will construct a sample block. You should circulate during this time to make sure each group has at least 5 or 6 answers and that they are all different and consistent. There will also be questions about which evidence to use during this time.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 2</b>—With 10 minutes left, tell students that one student from each group will be presenting the block of arguments to the class. Students will explain why they picked the arguments they picked and collaborate on the best strategies for each argument.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 3</b>—20-30 min: students present and edit each others blocks, talking through the best arguments and strategies in each block.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 4</b>—20 min: Students return to their groups and make edits to their blocks so each team will have the strongest blocks possible. Be sure all blocks are shared with all students.</p>
Formative Assessment	

Teacher Notes	
---------------	--



# National Association for Urban Debate Leagues Policy Debate Curriculum Pilot

## Unit 2: Topicality and Counterplans Preparing for the Third Tournament

Time Required

8 Lessons (8-10 hours)

Introduction

This unit is designed to prepare students for their second debate tournament. It includes a review of the first tournament and blocks. It also introduces two new negative strategies. At the end of this unit students will be able to:

- ⇒ Revise blocks based on the arguments they encounter during a tournament.
- ⇒ Identify the parts of a topicality argument and construct blocks to answer a topicality argument.
- ⇒ Describe the concept of opportunity cost and apply it to counterplan theory and argumentation.
- ⇒ Identify the components of a counterplan and develop strategies for answering counterplans.
- ⇒ Practice debating the states and courts counterplans.

If time allows the cross-ex challenge exercise in the additional exercises session is a fun way to hone cross examination skills after the first tournament.

Table of Contents

**Lessons**

- 17.....Tournament 1 Review
- 18.....Block Re-Writes & Redos
- 19.....Introduction to Topicality
- 20.....Answering Topicality
- 21.....Opportunity Cost & Competition
- 22.....Specific Counterplans
- 23.....Answering Counterplans
- 24.....CP & Permutation Theory

**Appendix 2**

- .....Key Terms
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

**Additional Exercises—Lessons**

- 33.....Cross-Ex Challenge
- 34.....Theory Pentathlon



Unit

2: Topicality and Counterplans, Tournament One Review

Time Required

8 Lessons (8-10 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 13: Tournament One Review

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will reflect on their first tournament.
- Students will identify arguments to improve their blocks for future tournaments.
- Students will integrate judge feedback to modify one rebuttal from their first tournament.

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-7, R-8, R-8, W1, W2, W5, W7, W10, SL-1, SL-4,

Teacher Prep

- Review student ballots from the tournament to get an idea of what went well and where there are areas for improvement. If the ballots are not already sorted by team, sort them by team to pass back to students.

Resources and Materials

- Students will need blocks and flows from their first tournament. They will also need their notes on judge feedback from each round.

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: 3, 2, 1 reflecting on the first tournament. List 3 things that went well, 2 questions you had and 1 thing you would like to improve for next time.
- ⇒ **Process 1**—30-40 min: Do an in-depth review of the 3, 2, 1 from the first tournament. List positives and improvements on the board and keep track of them so students can reference them as they work on blocks/speeches for the next practice. Answer questions as they come up. Students will hopefully be pretty excited and their questions will spur other students to ask similar questions.
- ⇒ **Process 2**—15 min: Transition letting students know that they are going to take the information they've shared to improve their current blocks for the next tournament and rework one speech they gave at the tournament. Have them sit with their partners from the last tournament. Pass back their ballots. Give them time to read through their ballots and see if what they read matches up with what they identified earlier.
- ⇒ For the next practice students should use the feedback that has been gathered by the whole conversation (3, 2, 1 discussion and ballot review) to improve the block they worked prior to the first tournament.
- ⇒ They should also use that feedback to rework one speech (either constructive or rebuttal) based on the feedback they received and the information gathered by the team conversation. They will give those speeches at the next practice.
- ⇒ **Note**—Some students may not have participated in their first tournament yet. In order to keep them engaged in the conversation encourage them to sit with partnerships who have attended tournaments during the ballot review exercise. You may also want to consider an optional secondary 3, 2 1 for those students. While those students will not have a speech to rework, they should still participate in the block rework exercise for next time.

Formative Assessment

Collect ballots with places where feedback aligns with student's 3, 2, 1 highlighted

Teacher Notes



Unit

2: Topicality and Counterplans, Rebuttal Redos/Block Rewrites

Time Required

8 Lessons (8-10 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 14: Rebuttal Redos/Block Rewrites

Time Required

90-120 minutes (depending on the number of students you may want to break this into two meetings)

Learning Goals

- Students will practice speeches that have been modified based on feedback from their judges.
- Students will modify and improve their blocks for future tournaments.

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-7, R-8, W1, W2, W5, W7, W10, SL-1, SL-4,

Teacher Prep

- Review student ballots collected from the last lesson to identify areas of improvement where students and their judges are aligned. Divide students into two groups—one group will focus on redos and flowing, the other will focus on block writing.
- Be sure feedback from tournament 1 is still visible (either leave it up, or transcribe it in some way that students will be able to see it while they work on speech redos and block rewrites).

Resources and Materials

- Students will need blocks and flows from their first tournament. They will also need their notes on judge feedback from each round from the last meeting.

Lesson Process

⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Divide students into groups. One group will be giving speech redos and flowing. The second will be rewriting blocks.

⇒ **Group 1**—Each student will redo one speech. The students not speaking will flow and provide feedback.

⇒ For each speech students should explain what positions are in the debate and how they are improving the speech.

⇒ For each speech one or two students should provide feedback on the redo.

⇒ For each speech the coach should provide feedback.

⇒ Try to keep coach feedback in the form of a “compliment sandwich” one thing done well, one thing to improve, one additional thing done well.

⇒ Repeat until all students have given one speech

⇒ **Group 2**—Students work on rewriting their blocks based on feedback from last time. It can be helpful to have a more experienced debater or additional coach in the room for comments/questions the students working on blocks may have. See Lesson 12: block writing workshop from unit one if you have questions about this process.

⇒ **Note**—If you are pressed for time you can run these processes concurrently and have students who are not speaking work on blocks until their speaking time comes up. This will accomplish both activities faster although it will limit student feedback and flowing practice during the Rebuttal Redo component of the lesson.

Formative Assessment

Review edited blocks to evaluate improvements, offer suggestions for additional improvements.

Teacher Notes



Unit

2: Topicality and Counterplans, Introduction to Topicality

Time Required

8 Lessons (8-10 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 15: Introduction to Topicality

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will define topicality.
- Students will identify the parts of a topicality violation.
- Students will compare two different topicality violations.

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-1, R-8, W1, W2, W7, W10, SL-2, SL-6,

Teacher Prep

- Review the Topicality portion of the Topicality and Theory Core File
- Review the key terms for Lesson 15
- Review the slides for Lesson 15 in the PowerPoint file

Resources and Materials

- PowerPoint slides
- Two different Topicality Shells—one to pass out as an example, the other cut up to be re-ordered by students.

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Use cartoon to generate responses to why staying on topic is important.
- ⇒ **Process 1**—Discussion (15 min): Introduce the visual of the topic. Walk through the following questions
  - ⇒ Why is it important to limit the number of plans we have in a year?
  - ⇒ What would happen if there were no limits on plans?
  - ⇒ Define Topicality
  - ⇒ Explain that it is the only stock issue where the negative has the burden of proof.
  - ⇒ Explain that it is a “do or die” issue for the affirmative—if they are not topical they lose even if they are winning other arguments.
- ⇒ **Process 2**—(15 min) Walk through the four parts of a topicality violation (see key terms).
  - ⇒ Using one of the T violations that you’ve prepared for the day identify each part with the students. Allow time for questions.
- ⇒ **Process 3**—(15 min) Pass out the envelopes with the cut up T violation and have students reconstruct it in order and then label the parts. They can do this activity in pairs.
- ⇒ **Process 4**—(10 min) Students share their reconstructed violations and compare to the correct answers.
- ⇒ **Note**—If you are pressed for time you can run these processes concurrently and have students who are not speaking work on blocks until their speaking time comes up. This will accomplish both activities faster although it will limit student feedback and flowing practice during the Rebuttal Redo component of the lesson.

Formative Assessment

Review edited blocks to evaluate improvements, offer suggestions for additional improvements.

Teacher Notes



Unit 2: Topicality and Counterplans, Introduction to Topicality  
Time Required 8 Lessons (8-10 hours)

Lesson Lesson 16: Answering Topicality  
Time Required 60 minutes

Learning Goals
• Students will review topicality arguments.
• Students will identify strategies to answer a topicality violation.
• Students will create affirmative blocks for two different topicality violations.

Learning Standards
CCR Anchor Standards:
• R-1, R-8, W1, W2, W7, W10, SL-2, SL-6,

Teacher Prep
• Review the Topicality portion of the Topicality and Theory Core File.
• Review the key terms for Lesson 16
• Review the slides for Lesson 16 in the PowerPoint file.

Resources and Materials
• PowerPoint slides
• Two different Topicality Shells that apply to the affirmative your novices are reading

Lesson Process
=> Setting the Stage—5 min: Mini-quiz to review the parts of a topicality violation
=> Process 1—Discussion (15 min): Remind students that we prepare blocks to make answering predictable arguments easier in a debate round. Ask for suggestions for answering Topicality. Most answers will fall in one of these categories—categorize them as students suggest them. If they miss one, add it at the end.
=> We meet—we meet the negative’s violation
=> Counter-Interpretation—another way to interpret the resolution that the affirmative definitely meets
=> We meet the CI—explanation for why the affirmative is topical under the counter-interpretation
=> Reasons to prefer the CI—reasons the topic is better under the affirmative’s definition than the negative’s
=> No impact to the violation (impact defense on the negative’s original arguments)
=> Reasonability—a frame for evaluating topicality that argues “we are close enough”
=> Process 2—(25 min) In pairs students should generate one of each type of argument for BOTH violations. They will need the affirmative topicality file to find counter-interpretation arguments.
=> Process 3—(15 min) Students share answers and discuss which will be most effective.
=> Note—these arguments will serve as their topicality blocks for the 2AC at the next tournament.

Formative Assessment
Review edited blocks to evaluate improvements, offer suggestions for additional improvements.

Teacher Notes



Unit 2: Topicality and Counterplans, Opportunity Cost & Competition
Time Required 8 Lessons (8-10 hours)

Lesson Lesson 17: Opportunity Cost & Competition
Time Required 60 minutes

- Learning Goals: Students will define opportunity cost, competition & counterplans. Students will identify the parts of a counterplan. Students will compare two ways to establish counterplan competition.
Learning Standards: CCR Anchor Standards: R-4, SL-1, SL-2, SL-3

- Teacher Prep: Review the Key Terms in the Appendix for Counterplans, Opportunity Cost & Competition. Review the slides for Lesson 15 in the PowerPoint file.

- Resources and Materials: PowerPoint slides. Opportunity cost cartoon handout

Lesson Process:
=> Setting the Stage—10 min: Use cartoons to introduce the idea of an opportunity cost. Have students generate their own definitions and then share them to jump start the conversation.
=> Process 1— (5 min): Explain that an opportunity cost is a forced choice between two options. Review the force choice in each cartoon.
=> Process 2—(15 min) Transition to the idea that the counterplan is a negative policy option that is an “opportunity cost” with the affirmative plan. If that is true, the counterplan is competitive and we can compare it to the affirmative plan.
=> Two types of competition (mutual exclusivity & net benefits—see definitions in the appendix)
=> Process 3—(10 min) Review parts of the counterplan
=> Process 4—(15 min) Pass out the states CP 1NC and Federalism DA, give students time to identify each part of the counterplan
=> Once each part has been identified have them answer the following questions (see handout or put on board)
=> How is the States Counterplan competitive?
=> Net Benefits—the Federalism DA is a net benefit to the counterplan. It is not mutually exclusive, both the states and the federal government COULD theoretically act.
=> Why does the states counterplan solve the affirmative?
=> States are closer to local issues and solve them better
=> States are more innovative
=> Wrap up—(5 min) Review students answers to the handout as a larger group.

Formative Assessment: Collect & review exit tickets. You’ll want to review this material again at the start of Lesson 18.

Teacher Notes



Unit

2: Topicality and Counterplans, Opportunity Cost & Competition

Time Required

8 Lessons (8-10 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 18: Types of Counterplans

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will review the components and types of counterplans
- Students will discuss and compare three types of counterplans

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-4, SL-1, SL-2, SL-3

Teacher Prep

- Review the States/Courts CP files. Review the Opportunity CP in the School Integration Negative
- Review the slides for Lesson 18 in the PowerPoint file.

Resources and Materials

- PowerPoint slides
- Counterplan

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Review competition, net benefits, mutual exclusivity and the parts of a counterplan from the previous lesson
- ⇒ **Process 1**—(25 min): Break students into three groups. They will review the CP shell and net benefits for one of the counterplans and then explain to the rest of the team what that counterplan does and identify the net benefit for that counterplan. It should take them 10 minutes to work in groups and each group has 5 minutes to report out.
- ⇒ **Process 2**—(20 min) Introduce that counterplans can change different parts of the aff. Some change the actor (agent counterplans), some change the process (the opportunity counterplan), some try to solve all of the aff a different way (states and courts) others only try to solve part of the aff and argue that other parts of the aff are made worse by the plan (the opportunity counterplan).
- ⇒ **Process 3**—(10 min) Questions or time for students to review the files that were not part of their group (if there are no questions)

Formative Assessment

Collect & review exit tickets. You'll want to review this material again at the start of Lesson 19.

Teacher Notes



Unit

2: Topicality and Counterplans, Opportunity Cost & Competition

Time Required

8 Lessons (8-10 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 19: Answering the Counterplan & 2AC Blocks

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will review counterplan arguments.
- Students will identify strategies to answer a counterplan
- Students will create affirmative blocks for three different counterplans

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-1, R-8, W1, W2, W7, W10, SL-2, SL-6,

Teacher Prep

- Review the States/Courts CP files, specifically the affirmative answer sections.
- Review the Opportunity CP in the School Integration Negative and the answers to it in the School Integration Affirmative
- Review the slides for Lesson 19 in the PowerPoint file.

Resources and Materials

- PowerPoint slides
- Key terms for lesson 19
- Counterplans

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Review the three counterplan files and their net benefits from the last lesson
- ⇒ **Process 1**— (15 min): Mini lecture—Introduce the types of arguments that we can make against counterplans. We'll try to STOP the CP. \*Note: Theory & Permutations will be new concepts and will require explanations (see key terms and slides)
  - ⇒ Solvency Deficit
  - ⇒ Theory
  - ⇒ Offense (against the net benefit or solvency)
  - ⇒ Permutation(s)
- ⇒ **Process 2**—(15 min) Pick one counterplan for students to generate answers to. They will have 5 minutes to think of possible answers and then will share them out for 10 minutes. As students share their arguments categorize them above. These arguments will become your blocks for answering these counterplans. \*Note: you will want student to supplement some of these arguments with pieces of evidence from the files.
- ⇒ **Process 3**—(15 min) Divide students into two groups of students to write a 2AC block for the remaining two counterplans.
- ⇒ **Process 4**—(10 min) Each group will have 5 minutes to share their 2AC blocks. Collect them, review them and be sure students have the finalized blocks for their next tournament.

Formative Assessment

Collect & review exit tickets. You'll want to review this material again at the start of Lesson 20.

Teacher Notes



Unit 2: Topicality and Counterplans, Opportunity Cost & Competition

Time Required 8 Lessons (8-10 hours)

Lesson Lesson 20: Introduction to CP and Permutation Theory

Time Required 60 minutes

- Learning Goals
- Students will identify theoretical objections to counterplans and permutations
  - Students will identify the parts of a theory argument
  - Students will discuss answers to common theory arguments

- Learning Standards
- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-1, R-8, W1, W2, W7, W10, SL-2, SL-6,

- Teacher Prep
- Review the Key Terms for Lesson 20
  - Review the Conditionality, Agents, and States blocks in the Theory Pentathlon activity.
  - Review the slides for Lesson 20 in the PowerPoint file.

- Resources and Materials
- PowerPoint slides blown up for Gallery Walk
  - Key terms for lesson 20
  - Blocks in the Theory Pentathlon File

Lesson Process

⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Review the three types of counterplans. Highlight why each action is different than the affirmative plan. Review affirmative strategies for answering the CP. Explain that today we will focus on Theory and Perms.

⇒ **Process 1**— (15 min): Mini lecture—Debate is unique because we can debate about the rules for specific types of arguments.

- ⇒ CP Theory: An objection to the type of counterplan action the negative has chosen.
- ⇒ Permutation Theory: An objection to the way the affirmative has argued for their permutation
- ⇒ Conditionality: A possible status of the negative’s CP that the affirmative can object to.
- ⇒ Note: The structure of all of these arguments is similar to a Topicality Violation, but will not include a definition.

⇒ **Process 2**—(15 min) Gallery walk and take notes on the different types of theory objections.

⇒ **Process 3**—(25 min) Discuss each type of theory argument and share briefly what it says and what the implication of that argument is (does the violator lose the argument or the round?). 5-8 minutes per argument. Some will be easier to talk through than others.

Formative Assessment

Collect & review exit tickets. You’ll want to review this material again at the start of Lesson 16.

Teacher Notes



# National Association for Urban Debate Leagues Policy Debate Curriculum Pilot

## Unit 3: Debating the Kritik Preparing for the Third Tournament

Time Required

7 Lessons (7 hours)

Introduction

This unit is designed to prepare students for their third debate tournament. It includes a review of the second tournament and blocks. It also introduces a new negative strategy. At the end of this unit students will be able to:

- ⇒ Revise blocks based on the arguments they encounter during a tournament.
- ⇒ Identify the parts of a kritik and construct blocks to answer a kritik argument.
- ⇒ Describe basic concepts from philosophy and apply them to kritik theory and argumentation.
- ⇒ Identify the components of a kritik and develop strategies for answering kritiks.
- ⇒ Practice debating the racism and neoliberalism kritiks.

If time allows the theory pentathlon and comparison idol games in the extra exercises section are excellent games to play to solidify earlier skills and learning.

Table of Contents

**Lessons**

- 26.....Tournament 2 Review
- .....Block Re-Writes & Redos
- 27.....Intro to the K
- 28.....Parts of the K
- 29.....Neoliberalism
- 30.....Racism
- 31.....Answering the K
- 32.....Block Writing for the K

**Appendix 2**

- .....Key Terms
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

**Additional Exercises—Lessons**

- 33.....K Author Presentations
- 34.....2017 UDNC Rounds



Unit	3: Debating the Kritik
Time Required	7 Lessons (7 hours)

Lesson	Lesson 21: Tournament Review
Time Required	60 minutes

Learning Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will reflect on their first tournament.</li> <li>Students will identify arguments to improve their blocks for future tournaments.</li> <li>Students will integrate judge feedback to modify one rebuttal from their first tournament.</li> </ul>
Learning Standards	<p>CCR Anchor Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>R-7, R-8, R-8, W1, W2, W5, W7, W10, SL-1, SL-4,</li> </ul>

Teacher Prep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review student ballots from the tournament to get an idea of what went well and where there are areas for improvement. If the ballots are not already sorted by team, sort them by team to pass back to students.</li> </ul>
--------------	---

Resources and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will need blocks and flows from their first tournament. They will also need their notes on judge feedback from each round.</li> </ul>
-------------------------	---

Lesson Process	<p>⇒ <b>Setting the Stage</b>—5 min: 3, 2, 1 reflecting on the second tournament. List 3 things that went well, 2 questions you had and 1 thing you would like to improve for next time.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 1</b>—30-40 min: Do an in-depth review of the 3, 2, 1 from the first tournament. List positives and improvements on the board and keep track of them so students can reference them as they work on blocks/speeches for the next practice. Answer questions as they come up. Students will hopefully be pretty excited and their questions will spur other students to ask similar questions.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 2</b>—15 min: Transition letting students know that they are going to take the information they've shared to improve their current blocks for the next tournament and rework one speech they gave at the tournament. Have them sit with their partners from the last tournament. Pass back their ballots. Give them time to read through their ballots and see if what they read matches up with what they identified earlier.</p> <p>⇒ For the next practice students should use the feedback that has been gathered by the whole conversation (3, 2, 1 discussion and ballot review) to improve the block they worked prior to the first tournament.</p> <p>⇒ They should also use that feedback to rework one speech (either constructive or rebuttal) based on the feedback they received and the information gathered by the team conversation. They will give those speeches at the next practice.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Note</b>—Some students may not have participated in their first tournament yet. In order to keep them engaged in the conversation encourage them to sit with partnerships who have attended tournaments during the ballot review exercise. You may also want to consider an optional secondary 3, 2 1 for those students. While those students will not have a speech to rework, they should still participate in the block rework exercise for next time.</p>
----------------	--

Formative Assessment	Collect ballots with places where feedback aligns with student's 3, 2, 1 highlighted
----------------------	--

Teacher Notes	
---------------	--



3: Debating the Kritik

Time Required

7 Lessons (7 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 22: Introduction to the K—Stars Conversation

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will discuss frameworks and contexts for ideas
- Students will identify a new argument: the kritik

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-4, R-5, R-7, W2, W7, SL-1, SL-3,

Teacher Prep

- Review the two Kritiks in the core files. Review the key terms for Lesson 22 in the core files to be prepared to lead the discussion introducing the K.

Resources and Materials

- PowerPoint slides for Lesson 22.

Lesson Process

⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Students write down answers to the question “What are stars?” on their own. \*Note—they will ask for clarification, it’s important that you don’t provide any. They should answer the question to the best of their ability based on their understanding of it. They should **\*not\*** collaborate with others to answer the question.

⇒ **Process 1**—15 min: Have each student volunteer one answer to the question “What are stars?” You will get a wide variety of replies from scientific explanations, to movie stars, to rewards, etc. This is good. Keep track of all of them, the more variety the better.

⇒ **Process 2**—15 min: Transition from the listing of all the different types of stars to a discussion of the importance of context for answering questions.

⇒ If we are talking about the media “stars” means something very different than if we are talking about science, astrology, school.

⇒ Kritiks are arguments that focus on the background framing of the plan rather than the actions that they take. They might focus on the economic structures that underlie the plan, or the demographic assumptions.

⇒ **Process 3**—20 min: Mini-discussion evaluating different elements of the classroom through the focus of the capitalist system

⇒ Introduce capitalism

⇒ Ask students to take a minute to evaluate the classroom and school day based on capitalism and jot down ways they’d interpret common items differently

⇒ Lead a group discussion evaluating some of the items they’ve identified (common suggestions, the clock and schedule, who made things like desks, chairs, etc., logos on people’s shirts, who sells food at lunch).

⇒ **Process 4**—5 min: Preview that next time you’ll focus on how Kritik arguments are structured, just like other arguments. Answer any questions students may have for next time. Optional: Assign students to identify 5 capitalist elements they encounter before the next class period. This works as a great Do Now for the next lesson.

Formative Assessment

Teacher Notes



3: Debating the Kritik

Time Required

7 Lessons (7 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 23: Introduction to the K—Parts of a Kritik

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will identify the parts of a kritik
- Students will review the idea of a kritik
- Students will define the parts of a kritik

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-4, R-5, R-7, W2, W7, SL-1, SL-3,

Teacher Prep

- Review the two Kritiks in the core files. Review the key terms for Lesson 22 in the core files to be prepared to lead the discussion introducing the K.

Resources and Materials

- PowerPoint slides for Lesson 23

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Do Now—have students define the kritik and review to confirm that they understand the basic idea of the argument from the last lesson.
- ⇒ **Process 1**—20 min: Mini lecture— define the parts of a kritik shell (\*Note, two of these will be familiar to students, two will be new). See definitions in the appendix.
- ⇒ Framework
  - ⇒ Link(s)
  - ⇒ Impact(s)
  - ⇒ Alternative
- ⇒ **Process 2**—15 min: Using the Neoliberalism kritik explain the thesis of the argument (it’s related to, but different from the capitalism argument from last lesson, see the appendix) pass out the shell and have students identify each part of the kritik in the shell
- ⇒ Students can do this in pairs or on their own depending on the ways they most effectively work. \*Note: they will struggle to find the “framework” component of the kritik because it’s not clearly labeled. That is by design, they are often not clearly labeled. We’ll use that to transition to the next lesson.
- ⇒ **Process 3**—15 min: Discuss each part of the neoliberalism kritik
- ⇒ Link—in the Wilson evidence, discussing the neoliberal focus on public schooling
  - ⇒ Impact—Naidu evidence “multiple wars, climate change, extinction”
  - ⇒ Alternative—von Werlhof evidence “ judge rejects neoliberalism as a political and economic ideology” \*Note: this is in the tag. The evidence provides solvency for the alternative, similar to a counterplan
  - ⇒ Framework—not clearly stated in the 1NC shell. Will be specified in the 2NC, however, given the arguments made so far, what do you think the underlying focus and frame of the K would be? \*Note: We are looking for them to identify that the K prioritizes economic systems and methods as the most important issue and starting point. Other kritiks will focus on different frames of reference as we’ll see next time.
- ⇒ **Process 4**—5 min: Preview that next time you’ll focus on different types of philosophy and how we prioritize issues. We’ll also look at another kritik 1NC

Formative Assessment

Teacher Notes



3: Debating the Kritik

Time Required

7 Lessons (7 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 24: Introduction to the K—Neoliberalism

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will apply the parts of a kritik to neoliberalism
- Students will discuss the ways neoliberalism interacts with affirmative cases

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-4, R-5, R-7, W2, W7, SL-1, SL-3,

Teacher Prep

- Review the neoliberalism file in the core files. Review the key terms for Lesson 24 in the core files to be prepared to lead the discussion introducing the K.

Resources and Materials

- PowerPoint slides for Lesson 24

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Do Now—have students define the kritik and the parts of the kritik from the last lesson. Review the answers as a group to check for understanding.
- ⇒ **Process 1**—20 min: Mini lecture— Review the basics of neoliberalism.
  - ⇒ Define the term (See appendix—lesson 23)
  - ⇒ Using cartoons slides, ask students to apply them to various concepts from this topic.
- ⇒ **Process 2**—15 min: Using the Neoliberalism kritik explain the thesis of the argument (it’s related to, but different from the capitalism argument from last lesson, see the appendix) pass out the shell and have students identify each part of the kritik in the shell
  - ⇒ Students can do this in pairs or on their own depending on the ways they most effectively work. **\*Note:** they will struggle to find the “framework” component of the kritik because it’s not clearly labeled. That is by design, they are often not clearly labeled. We’ll use that to transition to the next lesson.
- ⇒ **Process 3**—15 min: Discuss each part of the neoliberalism kritik
  - ⇒ Link—in the Wilson evidence, discussing the neoliberal focus on public schooling
  - ⇒ Impact—Naidu evidence “multiple wars, climate change, extinction”
  - ⇒ Alternative—von Werlhof evidence “ judge rejects neoliberalism as a political and economic ideology” **\*Note:** this is in the tag. The evidence provides solvency for the alternative, similar to a counterplan
  - ⇒ Framework—not clearly stated in the 1NC shell. Will be specified in the 2NC, however, given the arguments made so far, what do you think the underlying focus and frame of the K would be? **\*Note:** We are looking for them to identify that the K prioritizes economic systems and methods as the most important issue and starting point. Other kritiks will focus on different frames of reference as we’ll see next time.
- ⇒ **Process 4**—5 min: Preview that next time you’ll focus on another kritik 1NC

Formative Assessment

Teacher Notes



3: Debating the Kritik

Time Required

7 Lessons (7 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 25: Introduction to the K—Racism

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will apply the parts of a kritik to the racism K
- Students will discuss the ways the racism K interacts with affirmative cases

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-4, R-5, R-7, W2, W7, SL-1, SL-3,

Teacher Prep

- Review the racism file in the core files. Review the key terms for Lesson 25 in the core files to be prepared to lead the discussion introducing the K.

Resources and Materials

- Racism 1NC

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Do Now—have students describe the Racism DA and how it interacts with affirmative cases. Review the answers as a group to check for understanding.
- ⇒ **Process 1**—30 min: Mini discussion— Review the basics of the Racism K.
  - ⇒ Give students 10 minutes to read through the Racism K 1NC
  - ⇒ Ask students to pair up and identify key differences between the Racism argument as a K and as a DA. Below is a small sample of arguments they may identify (there may be others, prompt them if some of these aren't discussed)
    - ⇒ Framing is different (both the link and impact level) Compare the structural impacts with the K psychological violence impacts.
    - ⇒ Different types of links (compare the vouchers and Wilderson evidence)
    - ⇒ K has an Alternative—how does that change the argument?
- ⇒ **Process 2**—15 min small group/pairs/on their own: Compare the parts of the Neoliberalism K with the parts of the Racism K
  - ⇒ Students can do this in pairs or on their own depending on the ways they most effectively work.
  - ⇒ It may be helpful to write the parts of the K on the board as a reminder: Framework, Link, Impact, Alternative
- ⇒ **Process 3**—10 min: Discuss how the Racism and Neoliberalism Ks compare—what is similar, what is different? Go part by part:
  - ⇒
- ⇒ **Process 4**—5 min: Wrap up. Preview that next time you'll focus on ways to answer the Kritik.

Formative Assessment

Teacher Notes



3: Debating the Kritik

Time Required

7 Lessons (7 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 26: Answering the K

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will discuss strategies for answering kritiks
- Students will identify the parts of a K block

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-4, R-5, R-7, W2, W7, SL-1, SL-3,

Teacher Prep

- Review the K answers in both the racism and neoliberalism files.

Resources and Materials

- 

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Do Now—Review the parts of the racism and neoliberalism Ks to check for understanding with students
- ⇒ **Process 1**—30 min: Mini lecture—Introduce the types of arguments that we can make against the K. (Notice that this is similar to how we answer the CP with some additions). We’ll go F-POSTAL against the K.
  - ⇒ Framework—We need to defend our methodology and establish a role of the ballot for the judge
  - ⇒ Permutations—These are a bit different because K alternatives can vary widely in terms of who the actor is and what the actions are. The safest generic permutation here is “perm do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alternative.”
  - ⇒ Offense—Against either the link or impact level of the K
  - ⇒ Solvency Deficit—Alternatives will claim to solve the aff by resolving root cause claims. Debaters need to differentiate between root cause and proximate causes (see the appendix)
  - ⇒ Theory—This will likely be theory on framework, conditionality, or possibly against the nature of the alternative.
  - ⇒ Alternative—Disadvantages against the alternative
  - ⇒ Link—Attack the link level of the K with offense or defense.
- ⇒ **Process 2**—20 min small group/pairs/on their own: Using the affirmative sections of the racism and neoliberalism Ks try to identify pieces of evidence that align with each of the above arguments.
  - \*Note: There will not be evidence for the Theory section.\***
  - ⇒ Students can do this in pairs or on their own depending on the ways they most effectively work.
  - ⇒ It may be helpful to write F-POSTAL on the board as a reminder for each of the components they are trying to answer.
- Process 3**—5 min: Have students save and compile their work for block writing in the next lesson.

Formative Assessment

Review the evidence students have identified for block writing to ensure they are on the right track for answering the K. If you identify problems with the evidence selected, address them at the start of the next meeting.

Teacher Notes



3: Debating the Kritik

Time Required

7 Lessons (7 hours)

Lesson

Lesson 27: K Block Writing Workshop

Time Required

60 minutes

Learning Goals

- Students will collaborate on constructing blocks for their first tournament.
- Students will peer edit each others blocks.
- Students will explain their blocks to other groups.

Learning Standards

- CCR Anchor Standards:
- R-1, R-8, W1, W2, W7, W10, SL-2, SL-6,

Teacher Prep

- Review the K 1NCs for both neoliberalism and racism.
- Review the answers in both the racism and neoliberalism files.
- Review the cards students identified as answers at the end of lesson 26 and ensure they are appropriate for these blocks. Substitute better evidence as necessary.

Resources and Materials

- Core files.

Lesson Process

- ⇒ **Setting the Stage**—5 min: Do Now—Review the process for block writing from earlier lessons. If necessary identify new evidence that has been added from their card selections from the previous
- ⇒ **Process 1**—10 min: Review the elements of answering the K
- ⇒ Framework—We need to defend our methodology and establish a role of the ballot for the judge
  - ⇒ Permutations—These are a bit different because K alternatives can vary widely in terms of who the actor is and what the actions are. The safest generic permutation here is “perm do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alternative.”
  - ⇒ Offense—Against either the link or impact level of the K
  - ⇒ Solvency Deficit—Alternatives will claim to solve the aff by resolving root cause claims. Debaters need to differentiate between root cause and proximate causes (see the appendix)
  - ⇒ Theory—This will likely be theory on framework, conditionality, or possibly against the nature of the alternative.
  - ⇒ Alternative—Disadvantages against the alternative
  - ⇒ Link—Attack the link level of the K with offense or defense.
- ⇒ **Process 2**—(15 min) Start with either racism or neoliberalism. Have students construct blocks with a mix of analytics and cards. They may generate answers in addition to these, but be sure they hit each element of these arguments.
- ⇒ **Process 3**—(15 min) Repeat process 2 with the remaining K
- ⇒ **Process 4**—(15 min) Have students share arguments and check for understanding on each argument. Keep an eye out for arguments that may contradict each other, and offer explanations for arguments that students may be struggling with.

Formative Assessment

Review the evidence students have identified for block writing to ensure they are on the right track for answering the K. If you identify problems with the evidence selected, address them at the start of the next meeting.

Teacher Notes

### Lesson Two

- ⇒ Toulmin’s Model of Argumentation: Theory of how we construct arguments created by a rhetoric professor. We use a modified (simplified) version of Toulmin’s model in debate.
- ⇒ Claim: Statement we are trying to prove.
- ⇒ Warrant: Reason that the claim is true.
- ⇒ Implication: Reason we should care about the claim. In debate it’s much more common for us to use the term “impact” here.
- ⇒ Impact: See implication.
- ⇒ Data: Facts and other evidence being used to prove an argument.
- ⇒ Backing: Statements that prove the warrants are true (think of them like sub warrants).

### Lesson Three

- ⇒ Card: The way debate evidence is organized. Cards are segments of larger pieces of text that have been selected to prove parts of our case. We underline and highlight the parts of the card we are going to read in the round but we always leave all of the text so our opponents can see the surrounding context and know it supports our broader point.
- ⇒ Tag: A short (one sentence) summary of the point the card is making.
- ⇒ Citation: Attribution of who wrote the card. We read the bold part (name(s)/date) but we also include the following for information – first names/qualifications/title of piece/where the piece was published/URL OR publishing information (for hard copy texts)/page number.
- ⇒ Risk Analysis: A system for comparing different impacts.
- ⇒ Timeframe: How fast an impact will occur, this could refer to the time it will take for the impact to happen once triggered, the time it takes to reach its end point, or the fact that it’s occurring now.
- ⇒ Probability: The likelihood that an impact will occur. In the case of systemic/structural impacts that are happening now that is 100% (think racism, sexism, poverty) in the case of something like a war it is dependent on the internal links and other conditions that influence whether we will reach the brink (tipping point).
- ⇒ Magnitude: How big an impact is. This can be calculated in different ways. It could be size (global warming, for example, affects the entire planet, a war might affect the countries involved and spillover) or it could be the morality of an issue (racism must be rejected).
- ⇒ Scope: A subset of magnitude that looks at the breadth of the issue. For example if we compare a small regional war and a great power war the scope of the latter is larger because more people are affected and more countries are drawn in.
- ⇒ Structural Impacts: Impacts that are occurring now but are made worse by the action of the other side. You may also hear these referred to as linear/systemic impacts.



### Lesson Four

- ⇒ Flow: A system of note-taking to keep track of arguments in a debate round. Every competitor and the judge should keep their own flow.
- ⇒ Extend: Continuing an argument from a previous speech in the next speech. Arguments must be extended from speech to speech to stay active in the debate round and be evaluated by the judge at the end.
- ⇒ Drop: Not answering an argument or not extending an argument.
- ⇒ Cross-Apply: Using an argument that was made in one part of the flow in a different way in another part of the flow.

### Lesson Five

- ⇒ See Lesson Three

### Lesson Six

- ⇒ Reciprocity: In debate this refers to the structure of the debate round – the Affirmative gets the advantage of speaking first and last, they choose the plan and get the final word. The Negative gets a 13 minute block of time in the middle of the debate round to develop their argument and make it as strong as possible.
- ⇒ Affirmative: The side defending the resolution
- ⇒ Negative: The side proving that the affirmative plan is a bad idea or not part of the resolution.
- ⇒ Constructive: An 8 minute long speech where we build our arguments and possible strategies for the round. All new arguments must be introduced in the constructives. Each debater will deliver one constructive speech.
- ⇒ Rebuttal: A 5 minute long speech where we choose our strongest arguments to make our final case to the judges. With the exception of refuting arguments that were new for the first time. Each debater will deliver one rebuttal speech.
- ⇒ Cross-Examination: A 3 minute period where debaters ask questions of their opponent to clarify arguments and set up future arguments.
- ⇒ Prep Time: Each side is given the same amount of time to prepare for their speeches over the course of a round. It can vary geographically and by tournament. Usually it is 8 minutes (although 5 & 10 are also rarely used).



**Lesson 9**

- ⇒ Burden of Rejoinder: Teams must adequately respond to the arguments of the other side.
- ⇒ Status Quo: The current state of affairs. The negative defends the world as it is, without the affirmative plan.
- ⇒ Presumption: It is riskier to change things than to stick with the status quo. So if the Affirmative doesn't meet their Burden of Proof we should stick with the Status Quo and the Negative wins.
- ⇒ Offense: Reasons to vote for us (either side).
- ⇒ Defense: Reasons not to vote for them (either side).
- ⇒ Link Turn: We agree that your impact is bad but we think the action you took makes it worse, not better.
- ⇒ Impact Turn: The thing that you think is bad is actually good.
- ⇒ Double Turn: When you both link and impact turn thereby contradicting yourself and accidentally making an argument for the other team.

**Lesson 10**

- ⇒ Off case: Negative arguments that are not directly refuting the Affirmative case.
- ⇒ Disadvantage: An off case position that argues that the Affirmative sets in motion a chain of events that causes bad things to happen and that those things are more important than the Affirmative harms. Often abbreviated as DA or Disad. Disads are made up of four parts: Uniqueness, Links, Internal Links, and Impacts.
- ⇒ Uniqueness: A description of the status quo. States that if we maintain the current course things will be fine.
- ⇒ Link: Argument about how the action of the affirmative sets in motion a chain of events that changes the status quo.
- ⇒ Internal Link: There may be one or more of these – links in the chain to the impact. \*Note, the more internal links there are, the less likely the DA as a whole is, because each step has to happen to reach the impact.
- ⇒ Brink: The point of no return where the impact is inevitable.
- ⇒ Impact: The bad thing we are trying to avoid with the DA.
- ⇒ Federalism DA: Argues that currently the states control education policy and the affirmative changes that to move education policy to the federal government. That disrupts the balance of federalism which is bad.
- ⇒ Racism DA: This is a linear disadvantage, meaning there is no uniqueness section in a traditional sense. The argument is that racism is bad and the affirmative action exacerbates and participates in a racist system, which must be rejected.
- ⇒ Linear DA: Argues that while an impact may exist in the status quo the affirmative exacerbates and makes worse that system.



### Lesson 11

**Block:** A set of predetermined arguments for positions we know we will debate in the Constructives. Teams should have prewritten blocks for each disadvantage and affirmative contention they know they will debate.

Review Lesson 9 Terms

### Sample Block Arguments

### Lesson 15

**Topicality:** A stock issue that argues the affirmative plan must be part of the resolution. It is the only stock issue where the negative has the burden of proof (i.e., affirmatives only have to prove they are topical if that issue is challenged by the negative).

**Interpretation:** The negative argument for the ideal way to define a word or term in the topic.

**Definition:** The evidence presented by the negative to back up their interpretation.

**Violation:** The reason that the affirmative plan doesn't meet the interpretation and that the definition that the negative has chosen is better.

**Reasons to prefer:** The standards and impacts (i.e., reasons we care) about the topicality violation. Sample standards and impacts are below

**Limits:** The topic should be limited to encourage more in depth debates and better research.

**Ground:** Both the affirmative and the negative need adequate ground for a good debate topic, the affirmative interpretation either skews the current division of ground or takes ground that should be negative ground.

**Education:** Debate is supposed to enhance our knowledge of certain topics and an unfair division of ground hurts the education we get from a specific topic.

**Competing Interpretations:** A frame for how the judge should evaluate topicality preferred by the negative. It argues that topicality should be treated like any other argument and if the negative wins that their interpretation is even slightly better and the affirmative doesn't meet it, they should win the round.

### Lesson 16

**We meet (W/M):** An argument made by the affirmative that they meet the interpretation and violation of the negative.

**Counter-Interpretation (CI):** An alternative way to define a word or term in the resolution that the affirmative definitely meets.

**We meet the Counter-Interpretation:** An explanation of why the affirmative meets the CI they have suggested.

**Reasons to prefer the Counter-Interpretation:** Arguments as to why the CI is better for some combination of limits, ground and education than the negative interpretation.



### Lesson 16 (Cont.)

**Reasonability:** A frame for how the judge should evaluate topicality preferred by the affirmative. It argues that since Topicality is an all or nothing issue for the affirmative the standard for voting against the affirmative on T should be very high and as long as the affirmative proves they are a reasonable interpretation of the topic they should not lose, even if the negative interpretation is slightly better.

### Lesson 17

**Opportunity Cost:** There is a forced choice between two options, we cannot have both of them at the same time without a negative side effect.

**Competition:** Counterplans are a policy option that is an opportunity cost (forced choice) with the affirmative plan.

**Two types of Competition:** Net Benefits & Mutual Exclusivity.

**Net Benefits:** The plan and the counterplan could theoretically exist at the same time but it would trigger a disadvantage of some type that we want to avoid.

**Mutual Exclusivity:** It is impossible for the counterplan and the affirmative to exist at the same time.

**Parts of a Counterplan:** Counterplan text, Counterplan solvency, Net Benefit.

**Counterplan text:** Brief description of the alternative action that the negative proposes.

**Counterplan solvency:** Evidence that the negative's alternative action will solve all or part of the affirmative. \*Note, if it doesn't solve all of the affirmative you'll need to win offense or defense against the part of the affirmative it doesn't solve.

**Net Benefit:** Disadvantage avoided or advantage claimed by doing the counterplan rather than the affirmative plan. Net benefits are often on a separate flow and may be standalone disadvantages to the plan (i.e., the negative could win with a combination of CP + DA OR Status Quo + DA).

**States CP:** An argument that the 50 states should do the plan rather than the federal government. The net benefit is often the Federalism DA (see lesson 10).

### Lesson 18

**Types of counterplans:** Agent, Process, Advantage. \*Note, this is not exhaustive, there are others, these are the CPs in the core file set. Counterplans can be more than one type at the same time.

**Agent CP:** A counterplan that changes the actor of the affirmative plan and argues another actor would be better. (States & Courts)

**Process CP:** A counterplan that changes the process by which the affirmative plan is passed arguing that a different process would solve better. (States & Courts)

**Advantage CP:** A counterplan that solves for the advantages of the affirmative with other actions. This CP may solve all or part of the affirmative. If it doesn't solve all of the affirmative the net benefit may be turns against another part of the affirmative. (Opportunity CP)



### Lesson 18 (Cont.)

Courts: A counterplan that argues that the courts should rule on an issue rather than Congress acting in order to solve the affirmative.

Courts DA: The net benefit to the Courts CP—it argues that the courts acting is better than the Congress because it boosts the legitimacy of the judiciary. \*Note, this net benefit is an advantage to the CP, not a standalone DA. You must go for the CP to go for this DA.

Opportunity CP: An advantage counterplan to invest in resources, technology and teacher recruitment as an alternative strategy to solve for the harms of the School Integration affirmative.

Discrimination Adv. Case Turns: The net benefit to the Opportunity CP.

### Lesson 19

STOP: An acronym for the components of answering a CP to help students remember the strategy. STOP the CP. Stands for: Solvency Deficit, Theory, Offense, Permutation.

Solvency Deficit: An argument that the counterplan doesn't solve parts of the affirmative.

Theory: An objection to the action that the CP takes on the ground that it is unfair for some reason. This is usually a reason that the counterplan should not be evaluated in the round, not a reason the negative should lose. (There are a couple of types of theory arguments below).

Offense: (See Lesson 9) Offensive reasons either the action of the CP or the Net Benefit should be rejected.

Permutation: A test of the competition of the counterplan. This argument hypothesizes that all of the plan and all or part of the counterplan could exist at the same time, thereby making the counterplan not competitive. \*Note—This is a test. It does not change the affirmative plan and if the affirmative wins the permutation, it's only a reason the counterplan loses.

### Lesson 20

Possible CP Theory Arguments: 50 states uniform fiat is bad, agent counterplans are bad, conditionality is bad. See the Theory Pentathlon resources for examples of these arguments.

States Theory: This is a theoretical objection to the affirmative fiat that all 50 states act uniformly.

Agent Theory: Theoretical objection to changing the actor of the plan but keeping the actions the same.

Conditionality: Theoretical objection to the negative being able to advocate either the status quo or the counterplan. \*Note, this is one of the few theory arguments that could result in the negative losing the round, because it would be silly for the impact to losing this argument to be that the CP is conditional.

Permutation Theory: Severance Perms are Bad, Intrinsic Perms are Bad.

Severance Perms: An argument that the Permutation severs part of the affirmative which changes the aff and therefor isn't a good test of whether the CP is competitive with the affirmative.

Intrinsic Perms: An argument that the Permutation adds an element that was not in the plan or the counterplan and therefor isn't a good test of whether the CP is competitive with the affirmative.



### Lesson 23

**Framework:** Arguments made by the negative that the context identified by the kritik should be prioritized over the context prioritized by the 1AC.

**Link(s):** Arguments explaining what the affirmative team has done that ties them to the kritik. Note—unlike DA links, these are often more general, for example “complicity with the capitalist system.”

**Impact:** The terminal problems identified by the kritik. Note—unlike DA impacts, these are often root causal. For example: “Capitalism is the root cause of environmental collapse” 1AC and DA impacts tend to be more proximate and specific causes of a specific impact.

**Alternative:** The action the negative proposes to rectify the links and impacts they’ve identified. It is often \*not\* a state action and may involve anything from a rejection of the 1AC in it’s entirety to a thought experiment.

**Role of the Ballot:** How the judge should determine the round given the framework and prioritization claims of the kritik.

**Role of the Judge:** How the judge as an actor should make their decision (i.e., are they roleplaying as the state or acting as an educator in the round?)

**Neoliberalism:** Neoliberalism is a theory of how to organize the political and economic aspects of society. Central to neoliberal ideology is the idea of individual responsibility and choice. As a result, government structures under neoliberal systems feature less intervention and regulation. Further, economic systems organized based on neoliberal principles are free market systems.

**Free Market:** The free market refers to the organization of the economy under a capitalist system. It is organized based on the principles of supply (how much of something exists) and demand (how much people want a certain thing), which determine the price of goods and services.

**Capitalism:** Is the predominant economic system in America. Unlike socialist systems, a capitalist system is one with little government regulation. The profit motive drives individual decision making under capitalist systems. Capitalism is also based on the assumption that economic incentives are the most effective way to get individuals to carry out a certain social good.

**Reform:** Reform in this context refers to process of fixing certain elements of a problem rather than starting over. For example, in the context of education, reform means changing certain things that do not work instead of completely changing the way the public education system operates.

**Regulation:** Regulation in this context refers to the government intervening to fix a problem. The alternative to government action would be the free market addressing the situation when the economic incentives to do so arose.

**Ideology:** An ideology is a worldview or philosophy about how the world should be structured. Religion is one example of an ideology. In this context, neoliberalism is an ideology because it provides a framework for judging individual behavior, and provides guidelines for how to organize society.



### Lesson 23 (Cont.)

**Root cause:** A root cause is the main reason something happens. For example, the root cause of not being poor would be not having money. A “proximate”, or additional cause, could be lack of employment.

**Liberal:** Liberal in this context means something different from its usage in American politics, such as when referencing democrats who are liberal and republicans who are conservative. A Liberal in this context refers to a proponent of the ideology of “Liberalism”. Liberals believe, first and foremost, in individual freedom and autonomy. To this end, like neoliberals, they want less government intervention and more individual choice to regulate society.

### Lesson 24

**Anti-blackness:** the collection of structural disadvantages and actions taken by civil society that devalue the worth of black individuals.

**Achievement Gap:** the disparity in measures of educational performance among subgroups of U.S. students, especially groups defined by socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, and gender.

**H.R. 160:** a current congressional proposal concerning educational reform.

**Institutional Racism:** the pattern of social institutions, such as governmental organizations, schools, banks, and courts of law, giving negative treatment to a group of people based on their race. Requires access to power to carry out this discrimination.

**Ontology:** the branch of philosophy dealing with the nature of being.

**Epistemology:** the branch of philosophy dealing with how we know things.

**Solipsism:** the view or theory that the self is all that can be known to exist.

**Vouchers:** special scholarships awarded to students that allows them to attend school outside of their public-school district.

### Lesson 26

**Affirmative Framework—**Affirmatives need a framework that accomplishes a few things. These should include a role of the ballot, a role of the judge and a defense of the methodology of the affirmative that justifies weighing the impacts of the affirmative.

**K Permutations—**Because kritik alternatives often use different actors or rejection language often times saying “perm do both” as we do on a CP is nonsensical (you cannot both pass and reject the 1AC, for example). So K permutations need to highlight that the action of the plan can be done in the framework or context of the alternative. The best way to do this is to say “Perm: do the plan and <<insert non-mutually exclusive action here>>” if a debater hasn’t been able to figure out which part of the alternative isn’t mutually exclusive an alternative way to do this is to say “perm do the plan and all non-mutually exclusive parts of the alternative.”

**Offense—**identify either link or impact level offense to leverage against the kritik. It is almost always safest to read offense against the impact or alternative and defense against the link for a kritik.

**Solvency Deficit—**identify the impacts and benefits of the affirmative that are not resolved by the kritik alternative.



**Lesson 26 (Cont.)**

Theory: Theoretical objections to the nature of the alternative, framework, status of the K, or combinations of those.

Alternative: Offense against the alternative’s methodology or thought experiment.

Link Defense: reasons the aff mitigates the link or doesn’t trigger it to the degree that the negative has argued.

Types of K Theory:

Floating PIKs (Plan-Inclusive Kritiks): K alternatives that start as something vague like “reject the aff” and shift throughout the debate becoming a way that the 1AC can exist within the method of the negative (basically a methodology PIK that would include the action of the 1AC).

Conditionality: Same as conditionality for a counterplan round, but you should tweak your arguments to be specific to how kritiks function (for example, they are not a policy action).

Performative Contradictions: Happen when the negative proposes a CP or DA (policy action) that links to the kritik they have read. This is often a subpoint on a conditionality argument against a kritik.

Role of the Ballot: Reasons that the ballot and winning the debate matter. For example, is the ballot an indicator of who did the best debating in the round or an endorsement of a particular strategy?

Role of the Judge: How the judge should make their decision in the round. For example, are they an educator or a referee in a game?



Topic \_\_\_\_\_  
date \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>K</u>now</b> <i>What I think I know</i>	<b><u>W</u>onder</b> <i>What I want to know</i>	<b><u>L</u>earn</b> <i>What I learned</i>



May 1, 2017, at 10:51 a.m.

## **Trump Administration to Cut Some School Lunch Standards**

By MARY CLARE JALONICK, Associated Press

<https://www.usnews.com/news/news/articles/2017-05-01/agriculture-to-roll-back-some-standards-on-school-meals>

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Trump administration is ready to roll back some nutrition standards for federally subsidized school meals, reversing elements of first lady Michelle Obama's healthy eating initiative.

In his first major act in the Cabinet, Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue is planning an announcement Monday afternoon at an elementary school in the Washington suburb of Leesburg, Virginia. The Agriculture Department said ahead of the announcement that a new rule would provide "regulatory flexibility," though officials did not say what the changes would be.

The School Nutrition Association, which represents school nutrition directors and companies that sell food to schools, has said many of the standards are unworkable and lobbied to roll them back. They have argued for changes to whole grain and sodium requirements, in particular, saying it's hard to make foods that are high enough in whole grains and low enough in sodium that kids will eat.

They have also lobbied for more flexibility in rules that require kids to eat fruits and vegetables, saying those often get thrown away.

The Leesburg event is in the school district of the association's president, Becky Domokos-Bays, and she is scheduled to attend the event.

The association often clashed with the Obama administration, which phased in the healthier school meal rules starting in 2012. Obama pushed the changes as part of her Let's Move campaign to combat childhood obesity.

The rules set fat, sugar and sodium limits on foods in the lunch line and beyond. Schools have long been required to follow government nutrition rules if they accept federal reimbursements for free and reduced-price meals for low-income students, but the Obama administration's standards were stricter.



## Trump unwinding Michelle Obama's school lunch program rules

BY LYDIA WHEELER - 05/01/17 02:11 PM EDT

<http://thehill.com/regulation/healthcare/331400-trump-unwinding-first-ladys-school-lunch-program-rules>

Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue took steps Monday to roll back healthy school lunch standards promoted by former first lady Michelle Obama in one of his first regulatory acts.

In an interim final rule, aimed at giving schools more flexibility, Perdue and his department are postponing further sodium reductions for at least three years and allowing schools to serve non-whole grain rich products occasionally as well as 1 percent flavored milk.

The rule allows states to exempt schools in the 2017-2018 school year from having to replace all their grains with whole-grain rich products if they are having a hard time meeting the standard.

USDA said it will take “all necessary regulatory actions to implement a long-term solution.”

“This announcement is the result of years of feedback from students, schools, and food service experts about the challenges they are facing in meeting the final regulations for school meals,” Perdue said in a statement.

“If kids aren't eating the food, and it's ending up in the trash, they aren't getting any nutrition – thus undermining the intent of the program.”

Sodium levels in school lunches now must average less than 1,230 milligrams in elementary schools; 1,360 mg in middle schools; and 1,420 mg in high school.

Before Perdue's rule, schools were expected to reduce sodium even further to average less than 935 milligrams in elementary schools, 1035 milligrams in middle school lunches and 1,080 in high school lunches by the week by July 1, 2017.

Further reductions were set to take effect by July 1, 2022.

Perdue made the announcement Monday with Sen. Pat Roberts (R-Kan.), who has long been working to ease the standards.

“We worked really hard the last two years to provide flexibility, but after unanimously passing a bipartisan bill out of Committee, our effort stalled,” he said in a statement.

“The policies that Secretary Perdue has declared here today will provide the flexibility to ensure that schools are able to serve nutritious meals that children will actually eat. Because that is really what these programs are about: serving meals to hungry children so that they can learn and grow.”

The School Nutrition Association, which represents nutrition directors at schools across the country, was quick to praise Perdue. The group has been lobbying Congress for more flexibility in what they have called “overly prescriptive regulations.”

SNA claims less kids are buying lunch because they no longer like the food and schools are being forced to spend more money on lunches that largely end up in trash.

The former standards required all grains, including croutons and the breading on chicken patties, to be whole grain rich.

“School Nutrition Association is appreciative of Secretary Perdue's support of school meal programs in providing flexibility to prepare and serve healthy meals that are appealing to students,” the group's CEO Patricia Montague said in a statement.

“School nutrition professionals are committed to the students they serve and will continue working with USDA and the Secretary to strengthen and protect school meal programs.”

Health groups, meanwhile, claim the standards are working and that 99 percent of schools are in compliance.

“Improving children's health should be a top priority for the USDA, and serving more nutritious foods in schools is a clear-cut way to accomplish this goal,” the American Heart Association CEO Nancy Brown said in a statement Friday ahead of USDA's action.



$\rightarrow$	Leads To	$\Delta$	change
$\neq$	Doesn't Equal	$>$	Greater Than
$=$	Equal	$<$	Less Than
$\emptyset$	Not	$\sim$	Approximately
$(S)$	solves / solvency	$\$$	Money / spending
$(U)$	uniqueness	Heg	Hegemony
$(L)$	Link	GW	Global Warming
$!$	Impact	Econ	Economy
$\underline{x}$	Extinction	Ed	Education
$\uparrow$	Increase	FG	Federal Gov't
$\downarrow$	Decrease	$(T)$	Topicality



## Impact Calculus Mini-Debates

**Part 1:** For each of the impact cards below you will need to read through the evidence and write a 40 second speech explaining why that impact is more important than the other impacts. (You should have 4 speeches total). Remember to discuss **Timeframe, Magnitude and Probability**. Also, remember that some impacts access some of arguments better than the others, so you'll want to pick and choose the **BEST** impact calculus arguments for each impact.

**Part 2:** Now that you have your first speech written, find a partner. You are going to debate each impact using your speeches. One of you will defend the first impact, and one the second, at the end of the debate you will switch and defend the other impact.

**Remember:** Flowing will help you keep track of your opponent's arguments. You'll want to make arguments about why your impact is best **COMPARED TO** your opponent's impact.

After each debate reflect with your partner on the arguments that were strong and the arguments you might like to change in the future.

**40 second first speech**

**1 minute cross-x**

**40 second speech**

**1 minute cross-x**

**30 second rebuttal**

**30 second rebuttal**

Swap impacts and repeat. When you've both debated each impact continue to the second set.

## Competitiveness solves great power wars – it allows the US to promote vital interests abroad and de-escalate conflicts

**Colby**, Fellow at the Center for a New American Security; and **Lettow**, former senior director for strategic planning on the U.S. National Security Council staff, 2014 Elbridge, Paul, 7/3/14, “Have We Hit Peak America?” [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/07/03/have\\_we\\_hit\\_peak\\_america](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/07/03/have_we_hit_peak_america)

Many foreign-policy experts seem to believe that retaining American primacy is largely a matter of will -- of how America chooses to exert its power abroad. Even President Obama, more often accused of being a prophet of decline than a booster of America's future, recently asserted that the United States "has rarely been stronger relative to the rest of the world." The question, he continued, is "not whether America will lead, but how we will lead." But will is unavailing without strength. If the United States wants the international system to continue to reflect its interests and values -- a system, for example, in which the global commons are protected, trade is broad-based and extensive, and armed conflicts among great nations are curtailed -- it needs to sustain not just resolve, but relative power. That, in turn, will require acknowledging the uncomfortable truth that global power and wealth are shifting at an unprecedented pace, with profound implications. Moreover, many of the challenges America faces are exacerbated by vulnerabilities that are largely self-created, chief among them fiscal policy. Much more quickly and comprehensively than is understood, those vulnerabilities are reducing America's freedom of action and its ability to influence others. Preserving America's international position will require it to restore its economic vitality and make policy choices now that pay dividends for decades to come. America has to prioritize and to act. Fortunately, the United States still enjoys greater freedom to determine its future than any other major power, in part because many of its problems are within its ability to address. But this process of renewal must begin with analyzing America's competitive position and understanding the gravity of the situation Americans face.

## Impact - Racism must be rejected in every instance without surcease. It justifies atrocities and violence against people of color.

### Memmi 2000

Albert, Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ Univ. Of Paris, Albert (RACISM, translated by Steve Martinot, pp.163-165)

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved, yet for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism. One cannot even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. It is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which [person] man is not [themselves] himself an outsider relative to someone else?). Racism illustrates in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated; that is it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animality to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one's moral conduct only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism because racism signifies the exclusion of the other and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is "the truly capital sin."<sup>fn22</sup> It is not an accident that almost all of humanity's spiritual traditions counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. But no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. "Recall," says the bible, "that you were once a stranger in Egypt," which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming once again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal – indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality. Because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice. A just society must be a society accepted by all. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

### Genetic diversity from small farms key to prevent extinction.

**Boyce**, Department of Economics & Political Economy Research and Environmental research at the University of Massachusetts, **04**

(James K. Boyce, July 2004, “A Future for Small Farms? Biodiversity and Sustainable Agriculture”. Political Economic Research Institute, <http://ideas.repec.org/p/uma/periw/wp86.html>)

There is a future for small farms. Or, to be more precise, there can be and should be a future for them. Given the dependence of ‘modern’ low-diversity agriculture on ‘traditional’ high-diversity agriculture, the long-term food security of humankind will depend on small farms and their continued provision of the environmental service of in situ conservation of crop genetic diversity. Policies to support small farms can be advocated, therefore, not merely as a matter of sympathy, or nostalgia, or equity. Such policies are also a matter of human survival. The diversity that underpins the sustainability of world agriculture did not fall from the sky. It was bequeathed to us by the 400 generations of farmers who have carried on the process of artificial selection since plants were first domesticated. Until recently, we took this diversity for granted. The ancient reservoirs of crop genetic diversity, plant geneticist Jack Harlan (1975, p. 619) wrote three decades ago, ‘seemed to most people as inexhaustible as oil in Arabia.’ Yet, Harlan warned, ‘the speed which enormous crop diversity can be essentially wiped out is astonishing.’ The central thesis of this essay is that efforts to conserve in situ diversity must go hand-in-hand with efforts to support the small farmers around the world who sustain this diversity. Economists and environmentalists alike by and large have neglected this issue. In thrall to a myopic notion of efficiency, many economists fail to appreciate that diversity is the sine qua non of resilience and sustainability. In thrall to a romantic notion of ‘wilderness,’ many environmentalists fail to appreciate that agricultural biodiversity is just as valuable – indeed, arguably more valuable from the standpoint of human well-being – as the diversity found in tropical rainforests or the spotted owls found in the ancient forests of the northwestern United States.

### Economic decline goes nuclear

**Tønnesson**, Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo; **2015**, Stein, “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace,” *International Area Studies Review*, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 297-311

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among interdependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analyzed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.



## Theory Pentathlon

We will be doing a series of mini-debates on theory. The following pages have blocks for the 2AC and 2NC on each position. You are allowed to tweak and edit these blocks, however you will not be given extra time in the event that you add answers, so be careful. This is a single elimination tournament. The competition is one on one and the winner of each round will be determined by a vote of your teammates.

Round 1 Conditionality

Round 2 50 State Fiat Bad

Round 3 PICs

Round 4 Agent CPs

Round 5 Consult

Finals: Winner of the flip picks either the aff/neg OR theory debate, the loser of the flip picks the other.

2AC: reads block (30 seconds)

Block: 30 seconds

1AR: 40 seconds

2NR: 1:30 minutes

2AR: 1:30 minutes



## Conditionality Bad

1. **It's a Moving Target** – the negative doesn't have a stable advocacy throughout the round, allowing them to kick out of their counterplan to moot our offense.
2. **Time Skew** – The negative forces us to debate in the world of the status quo and the world of the counterplan, diminishing the 2AC's time on each argument. This destroys education by preventing in-depth development of arguments.
3. **Reciprocity** – We only get to advocate the plan, so the negative shouldn't get a counterplan and the status quo or it justifies severance and intrinsicness perms.
4. **It's a Voting Issue** – Allowing the negative to run conditional counterplans turns the side bias drastically in favor of the negative and destroys in-depth education.
5. **Counterintepretation Dispo** solves your offense and gives us the option to straight turn the counterplan and stick you with it.

## Conditionality Good Frontline

1. **Debate Is A Quest For The Best Policy Option** – If the CP isn't, then it should be allowed to be kicked at anytime. Within the situation, we are searching for the best policy option.
2. **Conditionality Is Real World** – In real life if we have an idea and then decide we don't like it we forget about it. It's real world to punt on something if it turns out to be bad. The status quo should always be an option for a rational policy maker
3. **Key To Education** – We need to learn about multiple policies. Conditionality is key to explore more ways of policy making,
4. **Permutations Check Abuse** –We are not running two conflicting conditional CPs that we can kick out of. Our conditional CP doesn't justify double turns or double binds. There's no in-round abuse as the affirmative can defend the perm and the plan and we can defend the status quo.
5. **All Arguments Are Conditional** – Counterplans are opportunity cost disads, and competition is our link. If there is no competition, it goes away like any other argument.
6. **Counter Interpretation: We Should Be Allowed To Have One Conditional CP**
  - a. **It's The Most Logistical Thought Process** – A rational decision maker confronted with two proposals of change, can always reject both, and keep them the way they are.
  - b. **It's Consistent With Real World Advocacy** – Faced with one proposal of change, opponents of a policy frequently offer a counter-proposal.
  - c. **No Extreme Skew** – Because there is a max of two proposals for the negative, there can never be an extreme or strategy skew like the affirmative suggests.
7. **It's Not A Voting Issue** – At worst you reject the argument, but not the team, if conditional counterplans are determined bad for debate then it should be rejected, but it is not a reason for us to lose the round.



## 50 State Fiat Bad

1. **50 State fiat is a voter** – we need to deter bad practices and reject the team to send a signal against the CP
2. **Interpretation** – The CP must have a solvency advocate and can't fiat uniformity
3. **It's utopian** - there's is no literature on all 50 states acting uniformly - they fiat through all of our solvency deficits and we can't get offense against the CP. Double bind either the counterplan is uniform and doesn't access any of the solvency evidence they've read or they access uniformity but have no evidence to support the CP
4. **Not Reciprocal** – we only get one actor you shouldn't get 50.
5. **Destroys topic specific literature** – Uniform fiat not in the literature makes it impossible to cut disads and solvency deficits to the counterplan .
6. **Its object fiat** – if this is truly state ground our inherency evidence is a reason those policies fail now – object fiat makes debate impossible no logical policy maker means the counterplan isn't a true opportunity cost to the aff.

## AT: 50 State Fiat Bad

1. **Reciprocity** – affs can fiat a plethora of actors within the federal government like the Department of Transportation
2. **It's real world** – the National Governors Association and National Conference of State Legislatures prove the 50 states work together
3. **Neg ground** – the states counterplan is a core neg generic on domestic topics – it's a key check against aff innovation
4. **Limits** – requiring a fed key warrant is key to determine which affs can be run strategically
5. **DAs don't solve our offense** – the counterplan is key impact defense against a multiplicity of advantages and add-ons
6. **Reject the argument, not the team** – community norms mean negs will never be deterred from running the states counterplan



## Plan Inclusive Counterplans Bad

1. **Steals aff ground** – We chose our case area and the plan, they can defend anything else. Allowing the neg to run pics strips us of our ability to make comparisons based on the merits of the plan we've chosen because they would gain all of those advantages through the CP.
2. **Infinitely Regressive** – Justifies doing the plan minus one penny and claiming a penny saved is a penny earned.
3. **Justifies aff severance** – If the neg can agree with 95% of plan, then the aff should be able to disagree with 95% of the plan. Therefore, perm to CP and vote aff.
4. **Makes us debate against ourselves** – They concede all but a tiny part of the plan, often stripping us of our best offense.
5. **Net benefits don't check abuse** – The disad alone would test the merits of the plan and the fact that they run a pic means that we're uniquely stripped of our offense against the disad.
6. **Leads to vague plan writing** – Affs will try to minimize the number of things the neg can exclude or do differently. This hurts neg ground and warrants the rejection of PICs altogether.

## Plan Inclusive Counterplans Good

1. **This Standard Destroys Counterplans** – If they were right, the negative can only counterplan with a different agent doing a different action – nothing would be competitive.
2. **Their Choice** – Aff determines ground with plan text, we get all else – this is best for competitive equity.
3. **Competition Checks Abuse** – There has to be a net benefit proving the CP doesn't endorse the plan and provides a reason to reject it.
4. **They Have To Defend The Whole Plan** – That includes the part of the plan we PIC'd out of.
5. **Reciprocal** – A permutation including all of the plan and part of the CP is legitimate even though it is partially inclusive of the CP.
6. **PICS Lead To Better Plan Writing** – Because they can get out of our PICS by writing a better plan text.
7. **Maximizes Best Policy Options** – Provides best topic education around plan.
8. **Every CP Is A PIC** – Because they must include all or part of the plan.
9. **No Implication** – Not our fault they worded their plan badly, worst case you reject the CP, not the team.
10. **Best Policy Option-Debate** is a search for the best policy option therefore you must evaluate all policy options no matter what it is. If there is a net benefit and it solves for the case it is the best policy option in the round and thus we must evaluate it
11. **Education**- Debate is for education and thus we should learn about many things, by advocating PICS we can learn about multiple plans.



### **Agent CPs Bad**

1. They only compete off normal means which we don't specify in the plan text justifies perm do the counterplan because their actor is part of the USFG.
2. Kills research and argument innovation – They run the same generic arguments every round, winning on them means there's no incentive for topic specific education which moots the resolution. Why change topics if the debate is always about the actor.
3. They don't have a solvency advocate for our plan, saying the executive did something similar once upon a time is not enough, hold them to the same standard you hold the aff to on solvency.
4. Infinitely regressive Normal means counterplans are no different than veto cheato, 9-0, 5-4, referendums, and delay counterplans which are the worst counterplans in debate.

### **Agent Counterplans Good**

1. Necessary to test the actor in the plan, who implements the plan is the heart of the topic and key to education about things like Civil Military Relations and policy implementation.
2. Textual Competition Best – Plan text provides a fair division of ground. They decide their case, we get everything that is not their case, key to competitive equity.
3. Most Real World – Federal Agencies vie for control over policies. The FCC role back of Net Neutrality being followed by a Democratic bill in the Senate to keep Net Neutrality proves.
4. Best Policy Option should determine who wins, key to critical analysis and learning cost benefit analysis skills which are the best skills we learn from debate
5. Reject the CP, not the team.



### Consult Bad

1. They fiat a moving targets-the outcome of the counterplan is never a stable advocacy and prevents us from generating offense against the result
2. They aren't predictable-there are an infinite number of actors that can be consulted-there are over 500 individual tribes, tribal governments, Congress, the President, and every random foreign country in the world
3. They rely on time-frame fiat, which is no different from delay counterplans, no affirmative could win a debate
4. Permute-do the counterplan, and then do the plan-its legitimate-the counterplan relies on time frame fiat which means the permutation is reciprocal and it solves the net benefit if they say yes; if they say no, the counterplan gets the case as a disad
5. Functional competition alone is a bad standard, justifies the worst process counterplans like Veto. Justifies perm do the counterplan. Prefer counterplans that are both textually and functionally competitive.

### Consult Good

1. Consultation CPs check the desirability of the process by which the plan is passed. No other CP provides the educational benefit of testing unilateral troop withdrawal versus other alternatives
2. Consultation forces them to defend the immediate enactment of the plan, which is key to core negative generics, allowing them to sever immediacy destroys politics and trade-off DAs
3. Literature checks abuse –
  - A. There isn't net benefit or consultation literature on every country, which sets a key limit on who can be consulted.
  - B. Counter-interp only consultation on countries with specific literature solves all your offense.
4. Consultation increases education—you learn more about international political systems and relations between countries.

Uncertainty increases aff ground – the counterplan guarantees a delay and potential non-adoption. All they have to do is win one say no argument and the entire CP goes away.

5. Net benefits check abuse –
  - A. The aff always has the option of straight turning the NB and not even dealing with the solvency of the CP. Proves we don't link to any of their “steals aff” offense
  - B. The research burden is inevitable- reading the counterplan as a disad still would've forced the research burden without gaining the additional topic based education based on unilateral withdraw vs multilateral

Best policy option—the search for perfection promotes real world education by comparing congressional unilateral withdrawal versus first withdrawing with prior consultation. The CP is key

Don't vote on potential for abuse. It's like voting on arguments they didn't make, in round abuse is the only objective standard.

Their interpretation is arbitrary – It's the same as rejecting all politics disads because there's too much stuff on the docket or they're too complex. Don't punish us because we're strategic.



### Reminders

Be on time. The tournament is located at: <Insert Address>. Breakfast is served at <Insert Time> Round one will begin promptly at: <Insert Time>. If there is bus information include it here, if students are arriving on their own, you may wish to include public transit information. Include tournament schedule information here.

Be sure to bring your cases and blocks.

Be sure to bring flow paper and pens (unless you are providing that for students, if you are, remind them where to locate flow paper and pens when they arrive.

Bring a folder to store your flows from the tournament. We'll be reviewing them at practice to improve for the next tournament.

Bring a notebook/way to take notes on your judges feedback for each round. We'll be using this to re-work speeches after the tournament.

If there are specific league requirements/norms they should be included here.

### Round by Round

Check the schematics for your team code. It will be your school name plus your & your partner's last initial. The schematic will also indicate if you are affirmative or negative, the judge in the room and the location of your debate. See the below screenshot:

Be sure you take good notes of your judges comments so we can use them to improve for future rounds.

Have fun!



Unit	1: Debate 101, Additional Exercises				
Time Required	11 Lessons (Time Varies: Check Each Lesson)				
Lesson	Cross-Ex Challenge				
Time Required	90—120 minutes, depending on number of students				
Learning Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will practice preparing for, and executing, strategic cross examination questions.</li> <li>• Students will evaluate cross examinations and provide feedback to their peers.</li> </ul>				
Unit placement	Tournament 1	Tournament 2	Tournament 3	Tournament 4	Tournament 5
Teacher Prep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will need the files for each DA and 1AC contention.</li> </ul>				
Resources and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA and Affirmative Core Files, Timer, Predetermined order for Questioners/Defenders.</li> </ul>				
Lesson Process	<p>⇒ <b>Setting the Stage</b>— 5 min: 3,2,1 on Cross-Examination. What are 3 things you should do in CX, 2 things you should avoid doing in CX and 1 thing about your CX you would like to improve?</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 1</b>—10 min: Review 3,2,1 to identify best practices in CX. Highlight that CX time is speech time and should be taken advantage of like other speeches. Write CX dos/don'ts on the board.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 2</b>—10 minutes: Introduce the activity. We'll be having a CX competition. There are 4 possible positions that you will prepare to CX. You get 90 seconds to ask your best questions. The goal is to successfully defend all 4 positions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ In each CX we'll have a Questioner &amp; a Defender.</li> <li>⇒ Successfully defending a position will earn you a point and you'll stay the Defender.</li> <li>⇒ Successfully questioning a position will dethrone the current Defender and the Questioner becomes the Defender.</li> <li>⇒ Once there is a new Defender, the next Questioner is up.</li> <li>⇒ You cannot defend the same position twice, you are trying to defend all 4 positions.</li> </ul> <p>⇒ <b>Process 3</b>—10 min: students prepare questions for each position (they will ask for more time, 10 minutes for CX questions on positions they already should be familiar with is more than they would ever have in a round.)</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 4</b>—5 min each: Have the first CX occur. When it is over, students turn their backs to the rest of the team, the team puts their heads down and votes on a winner. Announce the winner and ask one or two students to defend their vote. Try to call on students who voted different ways to generate conversations on best CX practices. <b>Repeat Process 4 until every student has had the opportunity to question another student. Depending on the size of your team and length of your practice you may want to split into multiple groups.</b></p>				
Formative Assessment	Have students spend 5 minutes on their own at the end revisiting the CX skill they wanted to improve and ask them to reflect on their improvement.				
Teacher Notes					



Unit	1: Debate 101, Additional Exercises				
Time Required	11 Lessons (Time Varies: Check Each Lesson)				
Lesson	Theory Pentathlon				
Time Required	90—120 minutes, depending on number of students				
Learning Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will practice arguing theory.</li> <li>• Students will evaluate theory debates and provide feedback to their peers.</li> </ul>				
Unit placement	Tournament 1	Tournament 2	Tournament 3	Tournament 4	Tournament 5
Teacher Prep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review theory terms and background from Unit 2. Create a bracket for the theory mini-tournament.</li> </ul>				
Resources and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theory Pentathlon file.</li> </ul>				
Lesson Process	<p>⇒ <b>Setting the Stage</b>— 5 min: 3,2,1 on theory. What are 3 things you should do when debating theory, 2 things you should avoid when debating theory and 1 thing about your theory debating you would like to improve?</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 1</b>—10 min: Review 3,2,1 to identify best practices in debating theory. Highlight that even though it doesn't have evidence theory debates should be well developed if they are going to impact the round. Write theory dos/don'ts on the board.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 2</b>—10 minutes: Introduce the activity, pass out handouts. We'll be having a theory debate mini-tournament. There are 5 rounds of theory to defend. The times for speeches are on your handout.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 3</b>—20 min: students prepare speeches for each round of debates. This should take closer to 20 minutes if students are on task, but feel free to allow extra time if they are using that time wisely.</p> <p>⇒ <b>Process 4</b>—8 min each: Have students debate. When it is over, students turn their backs to the rest of the team, the team puts their heads down and votes on a winner. Announce the winner and ask one or two students to defend their vote. Try to call on students who voted different ways to generate conversations on best theory debate practices. <b>Repeat Process 4 until you have a winner. Depending on the size of your team and length of your practice you may want to split into multiple groups.</b></p>				
Formative Assessment	Have students spend 5 minutes on their own at the end revisiting the theory debate skill they wanted to improve and ask them to reflect on their improvement.				
Teacher Notes					