


## Flow Chart<sup>1</sup> of the Final Round: Connecticut Debate Association, Guilford High School, March 1, 2014

### Resolved: RES.

The Final Round was between the East Catholic team of Jonathan Ockert and Cole Tamburri on the Affirmative and the Engineering and Science University Magnet School (ESUMS) of Newlyn Joseph and Odia Kane on the Negative. The debate was won by the Affirmative.

### Format Key

It's hard to reproduce notes taken on an 11" by 14" artist pad on printed paper. The three pages below are an attempt to do so. The first page covers the constructive speeches, the second page covers the cross-ex, and the third page covers the rebuttal. The pages are intended to be arranged as follows, which is how my actual flow chart is arranged:



Note that the first page containing the constructive speeches always has arguments related to the Affirmative contentions at the top, and those relating to the Negative contentions at the bottom. This is not how the speeches may have been presented, in that often a speaker will deal with Negative arguments prior to the Affirmative. The "transcript" version of my notes lists the arguments in each speech as presented.

The chart uses "A1," "N2," etc. to refer to the Affirmative first contention, the Negative second contention and so forth.

---

<sup>1</sup> Copyright 2014 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

First Affirmative Constructive	First Negative Constructive	Second Affirmative Constructive	Second Negative Constructive
1) Introduction 2) Statement of the Resolution 3) Definitions a) "compensation" is aid to help the economy and protect from climate impact b) "rich" is based on relative GDP 4) A1 <sup>2</sup> : Wealthy nations are more responsible for climate changing emissions a) CO <sub>2</sub> emissions are due to the industrial revolution. The rich nations started sooner i) A vast amount of CO <sub>2</sub> has been produced since the 1700's. b) The emissions are harming the environment i) The nations that caused it should be held accountable ii) They should help repair the countries and the climate 5) A2: The wealthy nations should be required to mitigate the detrimental effects a) Currently China is responsible for 23% of emissions, the US for 19%, almost half between them i) US and China have the highest GDP ii) They have a moral obligation due to present and past emissions b) E.g., crops in Bangladesh suffer from the heat c) We aren't talking about natural disasters, such as volcanoes d) But hurricanes and typhoons are intensifying due to warming 6) A3: Aid would be used to refocus the economies, first to sustain them and then to adapt to the changed climate a) First use would be economic subsidies i) E.g., climate costs Bangladesh \$500 million ii) Secondary effects occur in other economies due to lost production iii) It's a connected rule b) Second would be for things like genetically modified plants to adapt to the new world. 7) Restate A1, A2, A3	1) Intro 2) Definition a) "compensation" also implies the recipient should decide what to do with the funds b) "climate change" is that due to acts by humans 3) A1: We agree. This is self-evident 4) A2: The wealthy nations are the only ones with money, so if anything is done, they have to pay 5) A3: We disagree. This is imperialistic a) It makes poor nations adapt against their will b) Problem will still exist	1) Intro 2) A3: Aff is trying to solve the problem a) The cause is CO <sub>2</sub> emissions b) Allocate funds from those causing the problem to the victims c) First help sustain their economies, then work to cure the problem d) The "other" category is almost 200 countries, mostly poor 3) Neg offers no solution, Aff sustains then cures 4) Restate A1, A2, A3	1) Intro 2) Resolution 3) I'll cover cross-ex, Neg contentions, counterplan 4) Cross-ex brought out several major points a) Most CO <sub>2</sub> not from the rich countries, not the only cause b) Aff has no plan c) Problem isn't to sustain small countries, but to repair the climate
	1) N1: The Resolution ignores the root of the problem a) Aid to affected countries doesn't stop climate change b) Aid increases poor countries dependency	1) N1 vs A3 a) Aff plan first provides funds to fix the economy to withstand climate change b) Then funds can be reallocated to solve climate change	1) N1: Climate change is the main problem a) Air pollution, storms and smog in China can't be eliminated completely 2) N2: vs A1 a) Responsibility = blame

<sup>2</sup> "A1" indicates the Affirmative first contention, "N2" the Negative second contention and so forth.

	<p>2) N2: Implementation would increase tensions between rich and poor countries</p> <p>a) Implicit in “compensation” is a search for blame</p> <p>b) This “blame game” will hamper growth</p> <p>3) N3: It is unfair to expect poor nations to be energy efficient</p> <p>a) They need assistance no compensation</p>	<p>2) N2: China and the US are responsible for almost half of emissions</p> <p>a) They can afford to pay compensation</p> <p>b) It’s not a blame game, the rich have a responsibility</p>	<p>b) Nations all won’t want to pay the same amount</p> <p>3) N3: Aff plan is to rebuild then cure</p> <p>a) Can’t wait for Aff plan</p> <p>4) Counterplan</p> <p>a) Appoint the World Health Organization (WHO) to draft a contract for compensation with laws and regulations for all</p> <p>b) Provide guidance for spending amounts</p> <p>c) Conduct R&amp;D to sustain economies and cure climate change</p> <p>d) Funds will be allocated to UN organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)</p> <p>e) Compensation conditional on cooperation and set by WHO</p>
--	--	---	---

Cross-ex of First Affirmative	Cross-ex of First Negative	Cross-ex of Second Affirmative	Cross-ex of Second Negative
<p>1) Under A2 you say the rich countries are required to help? Yes</p> <p>2) Who will force them? There are 200 or so countries in the world who recognize the problem</p> <p>3) So they would have to agree to some sort of deal? Yes</p> <p>4) What if they disagree? One or two wouldn’t be a problem. Eventually they will realize the problem and comply</p> <p>5) You talk about replacing crops with genetically modified ones, providing resources? It’s a way to compensate</p> <p>6) Do all these countries rely on agriculture? Some do</p> <p>7) Is the climate problem solvable? This isn’t about solving the problem but alleviating the effects.</p> <p>8) You can pay compensation and adapt crops, but won’t the harmful effects continue? Nothing is being done now</p> <p>9) Your first contention says compensation is a moral responsibility? Mostly by the rich</p> <p>10) Are CO<sub>2</sub> emissions the only source of climate change? There are others</p> <p>11) What are they? [time]</p>	<p>1) You say adaptation is better than compensation? Yes</p> <p>2) Can’t compensation be used to fund adaptation? It won’t be spent on energy efficiency</p> <p>3) Can’t we boost the economy and then solve the problem? You have no mechanism to allocate funds. Countries won’t choose energy efficiency and climate cure</p> <p>4) How will the poor companies survive in the mean time? An agency of the UN can allocate funds</p> <p>5) Isn’t that still compensation? It’s more regulated</p> <p>6) Isn’t regulated compensation still compensation? It’s expanded, and on specific terms.</p> <p>7) Compensation leads to a blame game? Yes</p> <p>8) Aren’t the emission statistics clear? Can’t assign specific events to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from particular countries.</p> <p>9) What’s wrong with a simple percentage basis? The greatest contributor is “other”</p>	<p>1) I want to ask three yes or no question.</p> <p>2) Are there other causes of climate change than CO<sub>2</sub> emissions? Yes, but CO<sub>2</sub> is the primary cause</p> <p>3) Do you have a plan for implementing A2 and A3? Aff is responsible to support the resolution and doesn’t need to present a specific plan</p> <p>4) Do you have a plan? Provide funds to sustain the economies, then reallocate to solve the climate problem. But primarily we just want to affirm the resolution</p> <p>5) Do you have an enforcement mechanism? Yes and no. Rich countries have a responsibility to respond to climate change</p> <p>6) Yes or no? We don’t need one.</p> <p>7) How can you follow up if you have no implementation? Resolution reads “should”</p> <p>8) So you think the entire world will agree? We think it’s viable</p> <p>9) That all countries will agree? They will eventually</p>	<p>1) I’ll ask questions that require more than yes or no.</p> <p>2) Your plan is to have compensation determined by WHO? WHO couldn’t enforce the plan. They would need the UN Security Council</p> <p>3) Under the plan countries would just give funds? No, WHO would draft a contract</p> <p>4) So WHO will draft the contract but not act on it? Action will be taken by different organizations, like NGOs</p> <p>5) You said the Aff would have a hard time getting agreement, how will the Neg achieve it? The organization already exist, WHO, NGOs, etc.</p> <p>6) The contract would require them to distribute funds? Different countries have different regulations. You can’t force them to act.</p> <p>7) Doesn’t the plan require compulsion? Partially</p> <p>8) How does WHO avoid the blame game in N2? All the countries are already involved in these organizations.</p>

First Negative Rebuttal	First Affirmative Rebuttal	Second Negative Rebuttal	Second Affirmative Rebuttal
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Intro</li> <li>2) Two major concerns: immediate relief; long-term sustainability</li> <li>3) Neg fleshed out specific plan, Aff is vague</li> <li>4) Immediate relief <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Aff clashes with N1, as they propose welfare on a massive scale</li> </ol> </li> <li>5) Long term sustainability is ignored by the Aff <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) No guarantee funds will be reallocated to cure</li> <li>b) Remember our revised definition of compensation, where recipients choose what to do with the money</li> <li>c) Neg allocates funds and has regulations and inspections</li> </ol> </li> <li>6) N1: the resolution doesn't cure the fundamental problem</li> <li>7) N2: Aff doesn't take competitive blame game into account</li> <li>8) N3: Aff has no plan; Neg has a detailed plan</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) We have the status quo, the Neg Plan and the Aff Plan</li> <li>2) Status Quo <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) We lose 100 million lives and 3.2% of world GDP</li> </ol> </li> <li>3) Neg Counterplan was introduced in 2NC <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) It's very similar to the Aff case <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Neg is giving compensation</li> <li>ii) UN/WHO/Security Council all used for the Aff purpose</li> </ol> </li> <li>b) Neg plan has no local control</li> <li>c) Neg plan will be inefficient due to so many parties involved</li> <li>d) Security Council is controlled by 5 super powers who will have to make most of the payments</li> </ol> </li> <li>4) Aff plan was already on the board in the constructives <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Countries already recognize climate change problem</li> <li>b) We use the nations directly</li> <li>c) We provide aid to sustain economies while looking for a solution <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) We can't fix the problem if we don't support the economies in the mean time</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Aff then Neg</li> <li>2) A1: vs N2 blame game means some will resist responsibility <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Aff doesn't address the resolution</li> <li>b) Those causing the problem may not agree to pay</li> </ol> </li> <li>3) A2: Aff never explains how they will enforce payment</li> <li>4) A3: Why should affected countries adapt? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) This implies there will be sufficient research and development</li> <li>b) Aff has no plan to do this, and no way of knowing if they will do it</li> </ol> </li> <li>5) N1: Neg plan has laws and regulations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) We have addressed the Aff concerns</li> </ol> </li> <li>6) N2: See my comments compared to A1 above <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Neg has UN/NGOs allocating funds appropriately</li> </ol> </li> <li>7) N3: Neg plan trumps Aff plan</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Intro</li> <li>2) I will compare the two plans</li> <li>3) Both plans support the resolution <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) They are just different ways of implementing the resolution</li> <li>b) So the question is, are they legal?</li> <li>c) We believe the Aff plan is better than the Neg plan</li> </ol> </li> <li>4) N2: Aff doesn't believe there will be a blame game <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Both plans require a pooling of resources</li> </ol> </li> <li>5) A3: Aff recognizes the need for short term action and a long-term solution</li> <li>6) Neg plan <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Implemented by UN and associated agencies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Will the nations who are members all agree?</li> <li>ii) Will the UN agencies agree?</li> </ol> </li> <li>b) Aff is more efficient <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Countries act directly so no loss of sovereignty</li> <li>ii) In either case, nations have to work together</li> </ol> </li> <li>c) Aff funding goes directly to the problem,</li> <li>d) Neg plan puts wealthy nations in control <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Money comes from rich nations in either case.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>