

The Final Round¹

Everett Rutan

Xavier High School

ejrutan3@ctdebate.org

or

ejrutan3@acm.org

Connecticut Debate Association

Guilford High School

March 1, 2014

Resolved: Rich countries should compensate poor countries adversely affected by climate change.

A Note about the Notes

I've reproduced my flow chart for the Final Round at Guilford High School augmented by what I remember from the debate. The notes are limited by how quickly I could write and how well I heard what was said. I'm sure the debaters will read them and exclaim, "That's not what I said!" I apologize for any errors, but I hope debaters will appreciate this insight: what a judge hears may not be what they said or wish they had said.

There are two versions of the notes. The one below is chronological, reproducing each speech in the order in which the arguments were made. It shows how the debate was actually presented. The second is formatted to look more like my written flow chart, with each contention running across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It's close to the way I actually take notes during the debate.

The Final Round

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.

1) First Affirmative Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Statement of the Resolution
- c) Definitions
 - i) "compensation" is aid to help the economy and protect from climate impact
 - ii) "rich" is based on relative GDP
- d) A1²: Wealthy nations are more responsible for climate changing emissions
 - i) CO₂ emissions are due to the industrial revolution. The rich nations started sooner
 - (1) A vast amount of CO₂ has been produced since the 1700's.

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

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

- ii) The emissions are harming the environment
 - (1) The nations that caused it should be held accountable
 - (2) They should help repair the countries and the climate
 - e) A2: The wealthy nations should be required to mitigate the detrimental effects
 - i) Currently China is responsible for 23% of emissions, the US for 19%, almost half between them
 - (1) US and China have the highest GDP
 - (2) They have a moral obligation due to present and past emissions
 - ii) E.g., crops in Bangladesh suffer from the heat
 - iii) We aren't talking about natural disasters, such as volcanoes
 - iv) But hurricanes and typhoons are intensifying due to warming
 - f) A3: Aid would be used to refocus the economies, first to sustain them and then to adapt to the changed climate
 - i) First use would be economic subsidies
 - (1) E.g., climate costs Bangladesh \$500 million
 - (2) Secondary effects occur in other economies due to lost production
 - (3) It's a connected rule
 - ii) Second would be for things like genetically modified plants to adapt to the new world.
 - g) Restate A1, A2, A3
- 2) Cross-Ex of First Affirmatives**
- a) Under A2 you say the rich countries are required to help? Yes
 - b) Who will force them? There are 200 or so countries in the world who recognize the problem
 - c) So they would have to agree to some sort of deal? Yes
 - d) What if they disagree? One or two wouldn't be a problem. Eventually they will realize the problem and comply
 - e) You talk about replacing crops with genetically modified ones, providing resources? It's a way to compensate
 - f) Do all these countries rely on agriculture? Some do
 - g) Is the climate problem solvable? This isn't about solving the problem but alleviating the effects.
 - h) You can pay compensation and adapt crops, but won't the harmful effects continue? Nothing is being done now
 - i) Your first contention says compensation is a moral responsibility? Mostly by the rich
 - j) Are CO₂ emissions the only source of climate change? There are others
 - k) What are they? [time]
- 3) First Negative Constructive**
- a) Intro
 - b) Definition
 - i) "compensation" also implies the recipient should decide what to do with the funds
 - ii) "climate change" is that due to acts by humans
 - c) N1: The Resolution ignores the root of the problem
 - i) Aid to affected countries doesn't stop climate change

- ii) Aid increases poor countries dependency
- d) N2: Implementation would increase tensions between rich and poor countries
 - i) Implicit in “compensation” is a search for blame
 - ii) This “blame game” will hamper growth
- e) N3: It is unfair to expect poor nations to be energy efficient
 - i) They need assistance no compensation
- f) A1: We agree. This is self-evident
- g) A2: The wealthy nations are the only ones with money, so if anything is done, they have to pay
- h) A3: We disagree. This is imperialistic
 - i) It makes poor nations adapt against their will
 - ii) Problem will still exist

4) Cross-Ex of First Negative

- a) You say adaptation is better than compensation? Yes
- b) Can't compensation be used to fund adaptation? It won't be spent on energy efficiency
- c) 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
- d) How will the poor companies survive in the mean time? An agency of the UN can allocate funds
- e) Isn't that still compensation? It's more regulated
- f) Isn't regulated compensation still compensation? It's expanded, and on specific terms.
- g) Compensation leads to a blame game? Yes
- h) Aren't the emission statistics clear? Can't assign specific events to CO₂ emissions from particular countries.
- i) What's wrong with a simple percentage basis? The greatest contributor is “other”

5) Second Affirmative Constructive

- a) Intro
- b) N1 vs A3
 - i) Aff plan first provides funds to fix the economy to withstand climate change
 - ii) Then funds can be reallocated to solve climate change
- c) N2: China and the US are responsible for almost half of emissions
 - i) They can afford to pay compensation
 - ii) It's not a blame game, the rich have a responsibility
- d) A3: Aff is trying to solve the problem
 - i) The cause is CO₂ emissions
 - ii) Allocate funds from those causing the problem to the victims
 - iii) First help sustain their economies, then work to cure the problem
 - iv) The “other” category is almost 200 countries, mostly poor
- e) Neg offers no solution, Aff sustains then cures
- f) Restate A1, A2, A3

6) Cross-Ex of Second Affirmative

- a) I want to ask three yes or no question.

- b) Are there other causes of climate change than CO₂ emissions? Yes, but CO₂ is the primary cause
- c) 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
- d) 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
- e) Do you have an enforcement mechanism? Yes and no. Rich countries have a responsibility to respond to climate change
- f) Yes or no? We don't need one.
- g) How can you follow up if you have no implementation? Resolution reads "should"
- h) So you think the entire world will agree? We think it's viable
- i) That all countries will agree? They will eventually

7) Second Negative Constructive

- a) Intro
- b) Resolution
- c) I'll cover cross-ex, Neg contentions, counterplan
- d) Cross-ex brought out several major points
 - i) Most CO₂ not from the rich countries, not the only cause
 - ii) Aff has no plan
 - iii) Problem isn't to sustain small countries, but to repair the climate
- e) N1: Climate change is the main problem
 - i) Air pollution, storms and smog in China can't be eliminated completely
- f) N2: vs A1
 - i) Responsibility = blame
 - ii) Nations all won't want to pay the same amount
- g) N3: Aff plan is to rebuild then cure
 - i) Can't wait for Aff plan
- h) Counterplan
 - i) Appoint the World Health Organization (WHO) to draft a contract for compensation with laws and regulations for all
 - ii) Provide guidance for spending amounts
 - iii) Conduct R&D to sustain economies and cure climate change
 - iv) Funds will be allocated to UN organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)
 - v) Compensation conditional on cooperation and set by WHO

8) Cross-Ex of Second Negative

- a) I'll ask questions that require more than yes or no.
- b) Your plan is to have compensation determined by WHO? WHO couldn't enforce the plan. They would need the UN Security Council
- c) Under the plan countries would just give funds? No, WHO would draft a contract
- d) So WHO will draft the contract but not act on it? Action will be taken by different organizations, like NGOs
- e) You said the Aff would have a hard time getting agreement, how will the Neg achieve it? The organization already exist, WHO, NGOs, etc.

- f) The contract would require them to distribute funds? Different countries have different regulations. You can't force them to act.
- g) Doesn't the plan require compulsion? Partially
- h) How does WHO avoid the blame game in N2? All the countries are already involved in these organizations.

9) First Negative Rebuttal

- a) Intro
- b) Two major concerns: immediate relief; long-term sustainability
- c) Neg fleshed out specific plan, Aff is vague
- d) Immediate relief
 - i) Aff clashes with N1, as they propose welfare on a massive scale
- e) Long term sustainability is ignored by the Aff
 - i) No guarantee funds will be reallocated to cure
 - ii) Remember our revised definition of compensation, where recipients choose what to do with the money
 - iii) Neg allocates funds and has regulations and inspections
- f) N1: the resolution doesn't cure the fundamental problem
- g) N2: Aff doesn't take competitive blame game into account
- h) N3: Aff has no plan; Neg has a detailed plan

10) First Affirmative Rebuttal

- a) We have the status quo, the Neg Plan and the Aff Plan
- b) Status Quo
 - i) We lose 100 million lives and 3.2% of world GDP
- c) Neg Counterplan was introduced in 2NC
 - i) It's very similar to the Aff case
 - (1) Neg is giving compensation
 - (2) UN/WHO/Security Council all used for the Aff purpose
 - ii) Neg plan has no local control
 - iii) Neg plan will be inefficient due to so many parties involved
 - iv) Security Council is controlled by 5 super powers who will have to make most of the payments
- d) Aff plan was already on the board in the constructives
 - i) Countries already recognize climate change problem
 - ii) We use the nations directly
 - iii) We provide aid to sustain economies while looking for a solution
 - (1) We can't fix the problem if we don't support the economies in the mean time

11) Second Negative Rebuttal

- a) Aff then Neg
- b) A1: vs N2 blame game means some will resist responsibility
 - i) Aff doesn't address the resolution
 - ii) Those causing the problem may not agree to pay
- c) A2: Aff never explains how they will enforce payment
- d) A3: Why should affected countries adapt?
 - i) This implies there will be sufficient research and development
 - ii) Aff has no plan to do this, and no way of knowing if they will do it

- e) N1: Neg plan has laws and regulations
 - i) We have addressed the Aff concerns
- f) N2: See my comments compared to A1 above
 - i) Neg has UN/NGOs allocating funds appropriately
- g) N3: Neg plan trumps Aff plan

12) Second Affirmative Rebuttal

- a) Intro
- b) I will compare the two plans
- c) Both plans support the resolution
 - i) They are just different ways of implementing the resolution
 - ii) So the question is, are they legal?
 - iii) We believe the Aff plan is better than the Neg plan
- d) N2: Aff doesn't believe there will be a blame game
 - i) Both plans require a pooling of resources
- e) A3: Aff recognizes the need for short term action and a long-term solution
- f) Neg plan
 - i) Implemented by UN and associated agencies
 - (1) Will the nations who are members all agree?
 - (2) Will the UN agencies agree?
 - ii) Aff is more efficient
 - (1) Countries act directly so no loss of sovereignty
 - (2) In either case, nations have to work together
 - iii) Aff funding goes directly to the problem,
 - iv) Neg plan puts wealthy nations in control
 - (1) Money comes from rich nations in either case.