

THE FORENSICS FILES



Compete Prepared

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

TFF CONSIDERS POSTING THIS FILE TO ANY GENERALLY ACCESSIBLE WEBSITE, INCLUDING A SCHOOL'S PUBLIC WEBSITE, A WILLFULL INFRINGEMENT SUBJECT TO A **\$150,000** FINE UNDER 17 U.S.C. § 504(C)(2).

THE FORENSICS FILES

THE PFD FILE

Resolved

In response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests.

November 2015

Table of Contents

Topic Overview	3
Definitions	5
Pro Cases	11
Con Cases	15
Pro Extensions	19
Con Extensions	29
Pro Blocks	43
Con Blocks	47
Preflows	51

Topic Overview

Resolved: In response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests.

This topic asks whether “a government” should prioritize refugees’ humanitarian needs over its national interests in response to “the current crisis.” Although there are many ways that this topic could have been more clearly, it appears the resolution asking about the crisis involving refugees from Syria.

A refugee is a person who flees for refuge or safety, especially to a foreign country, as in time of political upheaval, war, etc., according to the Random House Unabridged Dictionary 2015. According to the European Union (EU), “an estimated 9 million Syrians have fled their homes since the outbreak of civil war in March 2011, taking refuge in neighbouring countries or within Syria itself. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), over 3 million have fled to Syria’s immediate neighbours Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq. 6.5 million are internally displaced within Syria. Meanwhile, under 150,000 Syrians have declared asylum in the European Union, while member states have pledged to resettle a further 33,000 Syrians. The vast majority of these resettlement spots – 28,500 or 85% – are pledged by Germany.”

The humanitarian needs referred to by the resolution include basic human needs that millions of Syrian refugees are having difficulty meeting because they have felt forced to leave their homes due to the violent conditions in Syria. Because of the sheer number of refugees leaving Syria, the nations that have been taking in most of the refugees have called for international assistance from other countries, including the U.S., to take refugees.

There are a few things to consider when debating this topic. First, the resolution does not clearly specify what “the current crisis” is. It could mean the Syrian refugees only or to the refugee crisis in a general sense. There are many refugees from other countries, particularly those in Africa. If “the current crisis” is used to refer solely to the Syrian refugee crisis, this could give rise to Con-side arguments that refugees fleeing other countries might be left behind or forgotten. Some teams might define “the current crisis” as some other crisis not involving Syrian refugees; for example, a team might argue there is a fiscal crisis in the United States. There is nothing in the resolution to suggest that there it intends “the current crisis” to mean anything other than the refugee crisis. Furthermore, defining “the current crisis” to mean something non-refugee related would define the topic in favor of one side: obviously allowing refugees to come to the United States would not be a good way to respond to the fiscal crisis. Therefore, the most likely definitional debate with regard to the phrase “the current crisis” is whether is referring to the Syrian crisis only or a broader refugee crisis including refugees from any country.

The prioritization language in the resolution adds two more interpretive complexities. First, the resolution asks whether a government should “prioritize” the needs of refugees over its national interests. This raises some questions: What if a nation’s national interests include accounting or providing for the needs of refugees? Does the resolution require a country to harm itself in accepting more refugees than it can provide for? If so, then is the country actually providing for the needs of refugees? Moreover, people can have priorities, but it does not mean they act in accordance with those priorities. For example, one might make it a priority to eat healthy over eating delicious, fattening food, but then decide to eat fattening foods despite the prioritization. In other words, must a nation always act in accordance with its official priorities? A team might argue that for moral reasons, a nation should prioritize refugees’ needs, but then also argue that the nation need not always act in accordance with its official priorities.

Second, the prioritization language begs the question of *how* a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs over its national interests. One way would be to accept refugees; another way would be to offer humanitarian aid to assist other countries that are taking refugees. These are policy considerations that both sides must be prepared for on this topic.

Other questions are raised by what the term “a government” means. The resolution does not specify a particular government. Read in context of the phrase “its national interests,” it is reasonable to infer the “government” mentioned must be a national government, as opposed to a local government. However, the resolution still does not specify what national government should be the actor. This will raise questions as to whether the teams must debate a hypothetical national government who is facing a moral quandary or a specific national government who is facing a policy question. Either way, this resolution will require Public Forum debaters to become familiar with policy-based arguments as well as arguments rooted in moral theories.

TFF wishes you the best of luck on this topic in November!

Definitions

In response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests.

Response

1. A reaction to something:

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Response

1. The act of responding.
2. A reply or an answer.
3. A reaction, as that of an organism or a mechanism, to a specific stimulus

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Response

1. an act of responding
2. something constituting a reply or a reaction

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Current

1. Belonging to the present time; happening or being used or done now:

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Current

1. Belonging to the present time:
2. Being in progress now

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Current

1. happening or existing now
2. belonging to or existing in the present time

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Crisis

1. A time of intense difficulty, trouble, or danger:
2. A time when a difficult or important decision must be made:

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Crisis

1. A crucial or decisive point or situation, especially a difficult or unstable situation involving an impending change
2. An emotionally stressful event or traumatic change in a person's life.

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Crisis

1. a difficult or dangerous situation that needs serious attention
2. an unstable or crucial time or state of affairs in which a decisive change is impending

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Government

1. The governing body of a nation, state, or community:
2. The system by which a nation, state, or community is governed:

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Government

1. The agency or apparatus through which a governing individual or body functions and exercises authority
2. A governing body or organization,

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Government

1. the organization, machinery, or agency through which a political unit exercises authority and performs functions and which is usually classified according to the distribution of power within it
2. the body of persons that constitutes the governing authority of a political unit or organization

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Should

1. Used to indicate obligation, duty, or correctness, typically when criticizing someone's actions
2. Indicating a desirable or expected state

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Should

1. Used to express obligation or duty:
2. Used to express probability or expectation

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Should

1. used in auxiliary function to express obligation, propriety, or expediency

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Prioritize

1. Designate or treat (something) as more important than other things:
2. Determine the order for dealing with (a series of items or tasks) according to their relative importance:

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Prioritize

1. To arrange or deal with in order of importance.
2. To put things in order of importance.

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Prioritize

1. to arrange (items to be attended to) in order of their relative importance
2. to give priority to or establish as a priority

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Humanitarian

1. Showing concern for the welfare of humanity, especially in acting to improve the living conditions of impoverished people.
2. Being a situation in which many human lives are in danger of harm or death

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Humanitarian

1. Concerned with or seeking to promote human welfare
2. Denoting an event or situation that causes or involves widespread human suffering, especially one that requires the large-scale provision of aid

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Humanitarian

1. Relating to or characteristic of people who work to improve the lives and living conditions of other people

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Needs

1. Expressing necessity or obligation:
2. Circumstances in which something is necessary, or that require some course of action;
3. A thing that is wanted or required

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Needs

1. Something required or wanted; a requisite
2. Necessity; obligation:

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Needs

1. something that a person must have
2. something that is needed in order to live or succeed or be happy

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Refugees

1. A person who has been forced to leave their country in order to escape war, persecution, or natural disaster:

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Refugees

1. One who flees, especially to another country, seeking refuge from war, political oppression, religious persecution, or a natural disaster.

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Refugees

1. Someone who has been forced to leave a country because of war or for religious or political reasons

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

National

1. Of, relating to, or characteristic of a nation
2. Of or maintained by the government of a nation

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

National

1. Of or relating to a nation; common to or characteristic of a whole nation:

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

National

1. of or relating to an entire nation or country

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Interests

1. The advantage or benefit of a person or group:
2. A stake, share, or involvement in an undertaking, especially a financial one:

Source: Oxford English Dictionary 2015

Interests

1. Regard for one's own benefit or advantage; self-interest

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language 2015

Interests

1. Advantage; Benefit

Source: Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary 2015

Pro Cases

PRO CASE #1

[Benefits — 1 of 2]

We believe the following resolution is true: “In response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests.” We are here debating whether the resolution is true. The specific topic before is whether, in response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests. We would like to make a couple points about what the specific topic question is about and is not about.

First, the topic says “a government” and asks whether that government should prioritize refugees over national interest. Thus, we can infer that the resolution requires us to debate about a hypothetical national government, it does not say the U.S. government or the Syrian government. However, we should be able to rely on empirical example to demonstrate that accepting refugees could be beneficial.

Second, accepting a single refugee is not necessarily in a nation’s best interest because we can assume that if the refugee’s basic needs are not being met, the nation will have to provide for it. If accepting a single refugee is not in a nation’s interest, then accepting more refugee who needs his or her basic humanitarian needs provided for is not in the nation’s immediate interest.

The thesis of our case is that although the short term provision of basic needs to refugees results in long-term gains that justify a national government prioritizing the basic needs of refugees over its immediate national interests.

First, despite the initial strain on national resources, helping refugees can help them integrate into society to fulfill their dreams of becoming doctors and lawyers. Nadia Abu Amr, United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013¹:

Despite the difficult conditions in which children live, refugee girls, boys, women and men are demonstrating incredible strength and resilience, finding creative solutions to the issues they face and providing support to their families, friends and even strangers. Many girls and boys refuse to let go of their hopes and dreams; their eyes light up when they announce that one day, when all this is over, they will become doctors, lawyers and teachers. While such an overwhelming number of refugees is placing an enormous strain on national systems, economies and even stability, the Governments of both Jordan and Lebanon continue to welcome Syrian refugees into their countries and facilitate their access to essential services, such as health and education. Many Lebanese and Jordanians are also reaching out to their Syrian neighbours in solidarity.

¹ Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams, http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

PRO CASE #1
[Benefits — 2 of 2]

Second, the refugee crisis is destabilizing smaller nations. When a government's neighbors are destabilized, this does not promote a national interest. Amr continues:

The unrelenting exodus of Syrian refugees to Jordan and Lebanon is having a dramatic impact on these small countries. Lebanon, with a population of a little more than 4 million, has received more than 800,000 Syrian refugees in two years. The economy, essential services and stability of the country are all suffering. Jordan, one of the most 'water poor' nations in the world, with a population of a little over 6 million, is now home to more than 550,000 Syrian refugees. It is also buckling under the pressure on its services, infrastructure and resources. While many Jordanians and Lebanese display kindness and generosity towards Syrian refugees, tensions between the communities—and even within refugee communities—have put refugee children at risk. The pressures of displacement and dramatic changes in lifestyle lead many Syrian refugee children to feel isolated and insecure, both within and outside their homes. Children, particularly girls, are often kept at home for their safety. However, the stressful and uneasy environment in which many refugee families live can also trigger tension and violence in the home. Case managers and social workers offer vital support and counseling and work with families to ensure that children are living in safe and appropriate conditions. Local and international organizations also offer a wide range of recreational activities to children and adolescents, to brighten up their day-to-day lives.

Third, Canada proves national governments can help solve the refugee crisis.

Adrienne Clarkson, writes in an Opinion-Editorial, for The New York Times, on October 7, 2015²:

In 1979, Canada responded to another refugee crisis: the plight of the Vietnamese boat people. Our public servants went to the refugees, rather than waiting for the refugees to come to us. They worked 20-hour days in hot, humid refugee camps throughout Southeast Asia. They identified, selected and approved 60,000 refugees on site. Then they put them on 181 charter flights, paid for by the Canadian government, and flew them to military bases in Edmonton and Montreal. The refugees were received, oriented and documented and then dispersed throughout the country to sponsoring Canadian groups who took the children to register at school, helped the parents find jobs and organized housing.

Thus, in response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests.

² www.nytimes.com/2015/10/08/opinion/adrienne-clarkson-canada-knows-how-to-respond-to-a-refugee-crisis.html

PRO CASE #2
[Children — 1 of 2]

“I believe the children are our future.” Because we agree with the late and great Ms. Whitney Houston, we believe the following resolution is true: “In response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests.” The thesis of our case is that millions of refugee children are in need, and governments have an obligation to help them.

We are here debating whether the resolution is true. The specific topic before is whether, in response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests. We would like to make a couple points about what the specific topic question is about and is not about.

First, the topic mentions the current crisis. We interpret this to mean the refugee crisis because, for one, the resolution asks whether governments should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees. Thus, the resolution is asking about whether governments should help refugees. The resolution DOES NOT limit the refugee crisis to any particular country’s refugee crisis. However, because the biggest refugee crisis is emanating from Syria, Syria is an appropriate topic.

Second, the topic says “a government” and asks whether that government should prioritize refugees over national interest. Thus, we can infer that the resolution requires us to debate about a hypothetical national government, it does not say the U.S. government or the Syrian government.

Third, the resolution does not specify how a government must prioritize the needs of refugees. National governments are considering (1) whether to let refugees into their country; (2) how many refugees to let into their country; and (3) whether to send aid to other countries who are accepting refugees. Regardless of how a national government prioritizes the humanitarian needs of refugees, we believe prioritization of refugees’ needs should come first to help the children.

First, the refugee crisis is tearing families apart. Nadia Abu Amr, et al, United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report in November 2013³:

The turmoil in Syria has torn families apart, with over 3,700 children in Jordan and Lebanon living without one or both of their parents, or with no adult caregivers at all. By the end of September 2013, UNHCR had registered 2,440 unaccompanied or separated children in Lebanon and 1,320 in Jordan. In some cases the parents have died, been detained or sent their children into exile alone out of fear for their safety. UN agencies and partners help to find safe living arrangements for unaccompanied and separated children, reuniting them with their families or finding another family to look after them. Despite living in already crowded conditions, Syrian refugee families continue to open up their homes to relatives or even strangers.

³ Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams. http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

PRO CASE #2
[Children — 2 of 2]

Second, the refugee crisis is causing hundreds of thousands of people physical and mental harms. Amr continues:

The conflict in Syria has caused Syrian girls and boys of all ages to suffer immensely, both physically and psychologically. Children have been wounded or killed by sniper fire, rockets, missiles and falling debris. They have experienced first-hand conflict, destruction and violence. The psychological effects of such horrific experiences can be far-reaching, affecting their well-being, sleep, speech and social skills. Living in crowded homes with family members who are also distressed, some children find little respite. In 2013, UN agencies and partners have already reached out to over 250,000 children across Jordan and Lebanon with various forms of psychosocial support.

Third, governments can provide for the needs of refugee children. Amr continues:

Research conducted over four months in Lebanon and Jordan found that Syrian refugee children face a startling degree of isolation and insecurity. If they aren't working as breadwinners—often doing menial labour on farms or in shops—they are confined to their homes. Perhaps the statistic we should pay the most attention to is: 29 per cent of children interviewed said that they leave their home once a week or less. Home is often a crammed apartment, a makeshift shelter or a tent. It should be no surprise that the needs of these children are vast. Too many have been wounded physically, psychologically or both. Some children have been drawn into the war—their innocence ruthlessly exploited.

In conclusion, governments should prioritize the needs of refugee children over national interests because, according to Whitney Houston, the children are our future.

Con Cases

CON CASE #1

[Altruistic Foreign Policy is Bad — 1 of 2]

We believe the following resolution is false: “In response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests.” We are here debating whether the resolution is true or false. The specific topic before is whether, in response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests. We would like to make a one significant about what the specific topic question is about and is not about.

The topic asks whether a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests. This requires a government to sacrifice its national interests for the needs of non-citizens. The Pro side might argue that accepting refugees is good for the nation, but this topic IS NOT about whether the benefits of accepting refugees outweigh the harms. This topic is about government priorities. If accepting refugees is good for the nation, then accepting refugees does not require a nation to prioritize refugees’ humanitarian needs over national interests. The resolution requires a national government to harm its interests for the benefit of non-citizens. The thesis of our case is that creates a foreign policy of altruism that must be rejected.

First, altruistic foreign policy has led to repeated disasters. Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, wrote a book in 2003 entitled The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, in which he argues:

It is, however, *America's* policeman. And that job is marily an intellectual undertaking. A heavily armed military is useless when backed by an ideologically disarmed State Department, It was not the military superiority of the enemy that compelled U.S. troops to flee Vietnam in 1975 — or that allowed Iran to capture our embassy in 1979 — or that caused the Marines to retreat from Lebanon in 1983 — or that drove American soldiers from Somalia in 1993. In all these cases, the cause of America's defeat was *ideological*, not military, weakness. The troops in Vietnam, the security guards at the Tehran embassy, the Marines in Beirut, the soldiers in Somalia — all had been ordered, in effect, to refrain from using the firepower available to them. And who issued those orders? The architects of our foreign policy.

CON CASE #1

[Altruistic Foreign Policy is Bad — 2 of 2]

Second, an altruistic foreign policy promotes dictatorships and strengthens the forces opposing freedom. Schwartz continues:

Nations, like individuals, must be objectively evaluated, by a rational standard, before they can be dealt with. This is the process of justice, which is the basic means by which our foreign policy protects our interests. We must recognize other nations for what they actually are in order to know how to act toward them. We must know whether they are essentially allies or enemies of America—which means: allies or enemies of liberty. The opposite of justice is: diplomacy—or, rather, diplomacy as it is practiced today, when U.S. officials simply refuse to identify a dictatorship as a dictatorship, and instead label it a "strategic competitor" with which we must maintain cordial relations. But justice does not permit such egalitarianism. Justice demands that cordial relations be maintained only with those *deserving* of cordiality. This implies certain broad imperatives for the conduct of a proper foreign policy.

Finally, only foreign policy of self-interest can check back the evil of altruistic foreign policy. Governments must embrace an all-encompassing foreign policy of self-interest. Schwartz continues:

But there is an alternative to this self-inflicted impotence: a foreign policy based on self-interest. This is a foreign policy that views the protection of Americans against international threats as its all-encompassing goal. The advocates of such a policy would reject any duty to sacrifice the wealth and the lives of Americans to the needs of other nations. And they would not seek the approval of other countries before deciding to use force to guard America's interests. Under such a foreign policy, Washington would not attempt to defend America in fits and starts, futilely trying to straddle the two roads of self-interest and self-sacrifice, attacking one terror-sponsor today while mollifying others the next day. Nor would it attempt to uphold self-interest as an amoral expediency—as advocated by the impractical pragmatists and their school of *realpolitik*. Rather, the designers of a rational foreign policy would understand that self-interest can be successfully defended only if it is embraced as a consistent, *moral* principle—a principle in keeping with America's founding values.

Because adopting an altruistic foreign policy should be rejected, a government should not prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its own national interests.

CON CASE #2
[Rights—1 of 2]

We believe the following resolution is false: “In response to the current crisis, a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over its national interests.” The thesis of our case is accepting refugees results in rights violations of a nation’s citizens. A government should protect, not violate the rights of its citizens.

First, prioritizing the needs of refugees over national interests means many refugees’ needs won’t actually be met and increases violent crimes. The Economist 2015:⁴

Processing centres exceeded capacity weeks ago. Local authorities are struggling to find housing, since temporary tent cities will not suffice in winter. The government of Hamburg has begun seizing empty office buildings to house refugees, raising constitutional questions. Berlin and Bremen are considering similar measures. Schools are struggling to integrate refugee children who speak no German. Fights have broken out inside overcrowded asylum centres, often between young men of different ethnic or religious groups. There have been more arson attacks on migrant centres. In Dresden, a xenophobic movement called Pegida is growing again: about 9,000 protested this Monday against refugees.

Second, a foreign policy of self-interest would protect rights. Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, wrote a book in 2003 entitled The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, in which he argues:

Thus, the same two injunctions that guide government domestically, in carrying out a policy of laissez-faire guide it internationally. The preservation of liberty requires inaction by government when no force has been initiated—and decisive action when it has. At home, when citizens engage in non-coercive behavior, the government does not interfere; but when someone initiates force, the police and the judiciary respond by subjecting the guilty party to (retaliatory) force. The same is true in foreign policy. With respect to peaceful countries, our government simply allows free, private trade to flourish; but in dealing with countries that physically endanger America, our government uses the military to retaliate against, and to get rid of, such threats. In both domestic and foreign policy, the proper role of government is to protect the citizen's basic political interest: freedom.

⁴ The Economist, Merkel at her limit, Oct. 10, 2015, www.economist.com/news/europe/21672296-after-historic-embrace-refugees-german-public-opinion-turning-merkel-her-limit

CON CASE #2
[Rights—2 of 2]

Finally, voting Con is the only way to protect individual rights and autonomy.
Schwartz continues:

On the premise of individualism, however, government has a thoroughly different nature. Its purpose isn't to take from the individual what he has earned, but to ensure that he has the freedom to earn it, and to keep it. Its function is to ensure that the rights of the individual are inviolate. When it comes to foreign policy, therefore, such a government views the national self-interest—i.e., the protection of the citizen's freedom—as non-sacrificable. Just as it recognizes each individual's right to exist for his own sake, rather than in servitude to others, so it espouses the derivative right of every free nation to act solely for its own interests, rather than in deference to the demands of some international collective. It acts for itself, and it acts by its own judgment. It does not subordinate its interests to those of other nations, regardless of how plaintively those nations trumpet their alleged needs. It does not feel guilty for the riches Americans have created, nor for the power those riches have made possible. It refuses to allow the failures of other nations to establish a claim upon America's success. And it does not surrender its convictions in order to placate the enemies of liberty. It adopts a foreign policy, in other words, that is consistent with the philosophy of capitalism.

For those reasons, you should vote Con.

Pro Extensions

A government's accepting refugees satisfies a moral urge to help others.

The Economist, Merkel at her limit, Oct. 10, 2015, www.economist.com/news/europe/21672296-after-historic-embrace-refugees-german-public-opinion-turning-merkel-her-limit

WHAT a difference a month makes. On the night of September 4th Angela Merkel made the most dramatic decision of her decade as German chancellor: to suspend European asylum rules and allow tens of thousands of refugees stranded in Hungary to enter Germany via Austria. It was a moral gesture that fitted the mood of the moment. As The Economist went to press, Mrs Merkel was considered a favourite to win the Nobel Peace Prize.

A government can alter other policies when accepting refugees; this can also lead to more public sector jobs.

The Economist, Merkel at her limit, Oct. 10, 2015, www.economist.com/news/europe/

In response Mrs Merkel's government is scrambling to make changes. It has passed legislation that cuts pocket money to refugees, currently €143 (\$160) a month, and replaces it with vouchers. More police and administrators are being hired. All Balkan countries have been declared "safe" so that their asylum applicants can be rejected and deported faster. On October 6th Mrs Merkel took charge of co-ordinating refugee policy, in effect demoting the interior minister, Thomas de Maizière.

Some countries do have the resources, technology, and infrastructure to help solve the refugee crisis.

Adrienne Clarkson, Opinion-Editorial, The New York Times, October 7, 2015, www.nytimes.com/2015/10/08/opinion/adrienne-clarkson-canada-knows-how-to-respond-to-a-refugee-crisis.html

Canadian immigration officials could be sent out once again to places like Kos and Lesbos to help screen and approve refugees. Canada is a country that aims to accept 350,000 people — 1 percent of its population — each year as immigrants and future citizens. Canada knows how to handle refugee crises, and we can show others how to do it better. We have retired immigration officers who would likely jump at the chance to offer their experience to German and Swedish officials struggling to manage this horrendous crisis. They could train their counterparts in European countries to assess and process refugees on site in Turkey so that families like the Kurds don't have to risk their lives and have part of their families drown. This would ease the rush to borders and help to bring some organization to what is now total chaos. With all the technology that is now available we should be able to process, identify and place refugees much more easily than we did in 1979.

Because of the current crisis, there is a whole generation of refugee children who are not receiving access to adequate education.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013

http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

A grave consequence of the conflict is that a generation is growing up without a formal education. More than half of all school-aged Syrian children in Jordan and Lebanon are not in school. In Lebanon, it is estimated that some 200,000 school- aged Syrian refugee children could remain out of school at the end of the year.

The refugee crisis is resulting in 77% of newly born babies being undocumented.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013

http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

Another disturbing symptom of the crisis is the vast number of babies born in exile who do not have birth certificates. A recent UNHCR survey on birth registration in Lebanon revealed that 77 per cent of 781 refugee infants sampled did not have an official birth certificate. Between January and mid-October 2013, only 68 certificates were issued to babies born in Za'atari camp, Jordan. Over 1.1 million Syrian children are refugees. This shameful milestone of conflict must deliver more than headlines.

A national government can prioritize the needs of refugees by keeping their borders open.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013

http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

For all the problems identified in this report, children have access to protection because countries like Lebanon and Jordan have welcomed them. No effort should be spared in supporting Syria's neighbours to keep their borders open. Further afield, in the past few months, many adults and children have lost their lives attempting to reach Europe. States must do more to ensure the safety of people attempting to cross water and land borders

A national government can prioritize the needs of refugees by helping other countries help refugees.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013

http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

The unwavering commitment of neighbouring countries to tackle the monumental task of supporting hundreds of thousands of Syrian refugee children must be matched by international solidarity. Overstrained school systems must be built up, health services expanded and local communities reassured that support is available for them too.

Millions of refugee children need help.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013

http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

Over 1.1 million Syrian children have registered as refugees with UNHCR worldwide. Of this number, some 75 per cent are under the age of 12. Children represent 52 per cent of the total Syrian refugee population, which now exceeds 2.2 million. The majority live in Syria's neighbouring countries, with Jordan and Lebanon combined hosting more than 60 per cent of all Syrian refugee children. As of 31 October 2013, 291,238 Syrian refugee children were living in Jordan, and 385,007 in Lebanon.

The refugee crisis is resulting in a significant increase in child labor.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013

http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

In both Jordan and Lebanon, children as young as seven years old are working long hours for little pay, sometimes in dangerous or exploitative conditions. While some girls are employed, notably in agriculture and domestic work, the majority of working children are boys. Sheer financial necessity is at the core of almost all cases of child labour. In some families, parents simply cannot find a job, do not earn enough to support the family or are unable to work owing to physical, legal or cultural barriers. An enormous burden falls on working children's shoulders. Some are mistreated in the workplace, are exposed to illicit activities or come into conflict with the law.

Syrian refugee children, especially disabled children, aren't able to go to school even though they want to. We need to make more opportunities available for the kids.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013

http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

The low enrolment rate is linked to a range of factors including school capacity, cost, transportation and distance, curriculum and language, bullying and violence, and competing priorities such as the need for children to work. Educational opportunities for children with disabilities are particularly limited. If the situation does not improve dramatically, Syria risks ending up with a generation disengaged from education and learning. Most Syrian refugee children are eager to go to school, and many parents also place high value on their children's education. UN agencies and partners in Jordan and Lebanon are working with the respective Ministries of Education to improve levels of enrolment and the quality of education—including by training teachers on how to work with refugee children, boosting the capacity of schools to accommodate more students, covering the costs associated with going to school, and providing school materials such as uniforms, books, bags and stationery.

The current crisis is tearing families apart and resulting in the deaths and detention of adults who can care for kids.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013

http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

Children have been particularly affected, many of them becoming refugees, some separated from one or both parents and sometimes with no adult caregiver at all. The scale of the problem was highlighted during focus group discussions and interviews across Jordan and Lebanon. Forty-three of 202 children interviewed said that at least one of their immediate family members was either dead, detained or missing. Tens of thousands of displaced children in Jordan and Lebanon are growing up without their fathers: as of 30 September 2013, there were 41,962 female-headed households in Jordan, and 36,622 in Lebanon. Not only are fathers absent; many children have no idea where they are.

The refugee crisis is tearing kids away from their parents.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013
http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

By the end of September 2013, UNHCR had registered 2,440 unaccompanied or separated children in Lebanon and 1,320 in Jordan—more than 3,700 in total. Unaccompanied children have been separated from both parents and other relatives and are not being cared for by an adult who, by law or custom, is responsible for doing so. Separated children have been separated from both parents, or from their previous legal or customary primary caregiver, but not necessarily from other relatives.

Governments can chip in to help reunite children with their families.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013
http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

UN agencies and partners help to reunite unaccompanied children with their families when this is what they want and it is deemed to be in their best interest.¹ When families cannot be found or traced, UNHCR and partners help children to find alternative arrangements, such as with another family in the community, and regularly monitor their well-being and living conditions. In Jordan, during the first six months of 2013, UN agencies and partners identified care arrangements in camps and urban areas for more than 800 unaccompanied and separated children. This involved tracing and reuniting children with family members in Jordan or abroad, identifying safe and appropriate care arrangements with extended family or other members of the community, and assessing existing care arrangements to ensure that they were suitable and safe.

The current crisis is psychologically scarring refugee children.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013
http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

The conflict in Syria has taken an acute physical and psychological toll on refugee children. They have witnessed unspeakable horror, which they struggle to forget. Bombs and missiles have destroyed their homes, communities and schools. Friends and family members were killed, sometimes before their own eyes. In Tyre, Lebanon, two UNHCR registration assistants, Tatiana Nassar and Therese Sarkis, invite children to draw during registration interviews. Children as young as four or five have drawn graphic images of rockets, guns, blood and houses that have been destroyed. Others have alluded to their desire to go home, writing statements such as “I love Syria” alongside their drawings.

Refugees children are suffering severe physical trauma and injuries.

Nadia Abu Amr, Rebecca Dowd, Leana Islam and Sara Williams., United Nations High Commission for Refugees Report, November 2013
http://www.unhcr.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/images/galleries/Future-of-Syria-UNHCR-v13low-res.pdf

Children of all ages, from babies to teenagers, have suffered severe physical trauma and injury from sniper fire, rockets, missiles and falling debris. According to UNHCR data, in the first six months of 2013, 741 Syrian refugee children received hospital treatment for physical trauma and other injuries incurred in Syria or Lebanon including burns, bullet wounds and broken bones. In Za'atari refugee camp, Jordan, 1,379 children were treated for weapon or war-related injuries between 20 October 2012 and 25 October 2013. The majority of these children, 58 per cent, were boys.

There are millions of Syrian refugees and the number is growing—fast.

Amnesty International, An International Failure: The Syrian Refugee Crisis, Dec. 13, 2013, www.sos-europe-amnesty.eu/content/assets/docs/An_International_Failure_-_The_Syrian_Refugee_Crisis.pdf

In the space of 12 months, 1.8 million people fled the armed conflict in Syria. By September 2013 the terrible milestone of two million refugees had been reached as men, women and children continued to pour out of the country. As of 9 December, the number stood at over 2.3 million registered refugees, 25.2 per cent of whom are children.³ In addition, at least 4.25 million people are displaced inside the country.⁴ In total, more than 6.5 million people have been forced to leave their homes in Syria, nearly a third of the country's population.⁵ In July 2013, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) said that "We have not seen a refugee outflow escalate at such a frightening rate since the Rwandan genocide almost 20 years ago".⁶

Third world countries are taking 97% of the refugees; rich countries can do more.

Amnesty International, An International Failure: The Syrian Refugee Crisis, Dec. 13, 2013, www.sos-europe-amnesty.eu/content/assets/docs/An_International_Failure_-_The_Syrian_Refugee_Crisis.pdf

Five countries neighbouring Syria - Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, Iraq and Egypt - host 97% of the refugees.⁷ In Jordan and Lebanon refugees from Syria have added 9 per cent and 19 per cent to the countries' populations, respectively.

Governments are failing miserably to help address the refugee crisis.

Amnesty International, An International Failure: The Syrian Refugee Crisis, Dec. 13, 2013, www.sos-europe-amnesty.eu/content/assets/docs/An_International_Failure_-_The_Syrian_Refugee_Crisis.pdf

Despite the enormous scale of the refugee crisis, the international community has failed miserably to support refugees from Syria or the main countries of refuge. The UN humanitarian appeal for refugees from Syria in the region – which represents 68% of the Syria humanitarian appeal, the largest such appeal in UN history⁹ - has remained less than 50% funded for most of 2013. At the time of publishing it was only 64% funded.

Governments who support military action against Syria are being hypocritical in being the least supportive of Syrian refugees.

Amnesty International, An International Failure: The Syrian Refugee Crisis, Dec. 13, 2013, www.sos-europe-amnesty.eu/content/assets/docs/An_International_Failure_-_The_Syrian_Refugee_Crisis.pdf

It is not just the EU that is failing to make resettlement places available. Countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) have not offered any resettlement or humanitarian admission places to refugees from Syria. Some of the governments that have been the most prominent supporters of military action in Syria have also been the least forthcoming when it comes to making resettlement places available to refugees from Syria. The UK, Saudi Arabia and Qatar have not offered to take any refugees from Syria. France offered to take 500 refugees, or 0.02% of those in the main host countries.

The war-torn conditions of Syria has caused many people to flee and seek safety.

Amnesty International, An International Failure: The Syrian Refugee Crisis, Dec. 13, 2013, www.sos-europe-amnesty.eu/content/assets/docs/An_International_Failure_-_The_Syrian_Refugee_Crisis.pdf

The two-year conflict between the Syrian government and armed opposition groups has left more than 100,000 people dead²² and hundreds of thousands of civilians injured.²³ The conflict has also caused massive destruction of civilian property and the displacement of at least 4.25 million people internally.²⁴ More than 2.3 million people have fled the country. The influx of refugees in Syria's neighbouring countries has put an immense strain on the limited resources available in those countries, particularly in Jordan and Lebanon, where many refugees are living in precarious conditions in overcrowded refugee camps or in host communities, including in informal settlements.

Nongovernmental organizations cannot do it alone; national governments need to help.

Amnesty International, An International Failure: The Syrian Refugee Crisis, Dec. 13, 2013, www.sos-europe-amnesty.eu/content/assets/docs/An_International_Failure_-_The_Syrian_Refugee_Crisis.pdf

In order to provide adequate protection and humanitarian assistance to refugees from Syria and those in need within Syria, in July the UN made the largest humanitarian appeal in its history, calling for around \$3 billion in assistance to UN agencies and NGOs working with refugees, \$830 million for the governments of Lebanon and Jordan and \$1.4 billion for people inside Syria.²⁵ Only 64% of the \$3 billion had been committed as of 6 December 2013.²⁶ In September, the UN warned that funding shortfalls could result in a cutback in aid to refugees.

The countries currently taking refugees are overstretched; more governments need to help out.

Amnesty International, An International Failure: The Syrian Refugee Crisis, Dec. 13, 2013, www.sos-europe-amnesty.eu/content/assets/docs/An_International_Failure_-_The_Syrian_Refugee_Crisis.pdf

Among the five main host countries for refugees from Syria, Lebanon and Jordan host the largest number of refugees, both in absolute terms and as a proportion of their own populations. The infrastructure of Jordan – which has to import much of its energy, water and grain – is overstretched with much increased demand for water, electricity, housing, schools, health care, and food. It would reportedly cost Jordan USD \$706 million annually to meet this increased demand for water.³⁵ Some residential areas are struggling to accommodate particularly large refugee populations and frustrations among many sectors of the population have grown, as rents increase and there is increased competition for jobs. In Lebanon, the number of refugees has put a strain on already limited resources, including water and sewage facilities, public schools, hospitals and other utilities.³⁶ According to the World Bank, the growing refugee population is expected to increase poverty and unemployment in Lebanon and further stretch the budget situation in the country, which currently faces one of the highest debt ratios globally.³⁷ The conflict in Syria has a significant impact on the political and security environment in Lebanon, with upsurges in violence in areas of Lebanon bordering Syria, including Aarsal in northeast Lebanon in November 2013,³⁸ and in Tripoli in north Lebanon most recently in November and December 2013, the latter of which has resulted in at least 10 people dead and 49 injured.

The international community shares a responsibility to help resolve the current refugee crisis.

Amnesty International, An International Failure: The Syrian Refugee Crisis, Dec. 13, 2013, www.sos-europe-amnesty.eu/content/assets/docs/An_International_Failure_-_The_Syrian_Refugee_Crisis.pdf

As the numbers of refugees from Syria continues to grow, the EU and its Member States must do more to provide assistance and protection to those who arrive in Europe, and to share the responsibility for hosting refugees more equally. Refugees from Syria, including those seeking to join family members already in the EU, must be able to find safety by legally travelling to Europe. The international community, including the EU and its Member States should increase support through the UN humanitarian appeals and bilaterally to countries hosting the largest numbers of refugees, particularly Jordan and Lebanon. Resettlement places must be significantly increased, providing an important opportunity for those most in need to enable them to receive adequate support and restart their lives.

We need to apply a different standard than economics and self-interest in addressing the refugee crisis. Our souls and integrity are on the line.

Yanis Varoufakis, a Greek-Australian economist, The Refugee Crisis, Immanuel Kant And Germany's Moral Leadership, September 16, 2015, www.socialeurope.eu/2015/09/the-refugee-crisis-immanuel-kant-and-germanys-moral-leadership

Economists err when they think that human rationality is all about applying one's means efficiently in order to achieve one's ends. That the efficient application of available resources in the pursuit of given objectives is an important dimension of our Reason, there is no doubt. The error however sips in when economists, and those influenced by them, assume that this is all rationality is about. This type of instrumental approach to the meaning of Reason massively underestimates perhaps the one ingredient of human reasoning that makes us exceptional animals: the capacity to subject our ends, our objectives, to rational scrutiny. To ask ourselves not just questions such as "Should I invest in bonds or shares?" but also questions of the type: "I like X but should I like it?" This summer we, Europeans, faced major challenges to our integrity and soul. The inflow of refugees tested our humanity and our rationality felt the strain of needing to make hard choices. Most European nations, and their governments, failed the test of history spectacularly. Closing borders down, stopping trains on their tracks, treating people in need as an existentialist threat, indulging in bickering at the level of the European Union as to who will bear a lesser part of the burden – all in all, Europe behaved abominably leading the Italian Prime Minister to utter in desperation: "If this is Europe, I do not want to be part of it."

Taking in refugees can be beneficial to national governments.

Yanis Varoufakis, a Greek-Australian economist, The Refugee Crisis, Immanuel Kant And Germany's Moral Leadership, September 16, 2015,
www.socialeurope.eu/2015/09/the-refugee-crisis-immanuel-kant-and-germanys-moral-leadership

Poor German demographics may be helped by an influx of relatively young, highly motivated, mostly well-educated fleeing Syrians. Guntram Wolff, in the Financial Times, recently drew a historical comparison with a 17th Century influx of French protestant refugees into the state of Brandenburg, who brought in with them skills and dynamism. Employers rejoice at the thought of more workers, putting downward pressure on wage costs, while macroeconomists try to calculate the fiscal costs to the welfare system in relation to the economic benefits from a boost in aggregate demand.

Con Extensions

The Pro side endorses a foreign policy of altruism, putting the interests of others over the interests of the United States.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 10, 2004

The premise shaping our foreign policy is that we must sacrifice ourselves for the sake of weaker nations because self-interest cannot be the standard of our actions. Thus, if Africa needs money to deal with a medical crisis, America provides it. If Mexico needs another massive loan—America arranges it. If China needs nuclear technology—America furnishes it. If troops are needed in Kosovo to separate murderous ethnic clans, or in Somalia to neutralize some local warlord, or in Liberia to interpose themselves among the factions of a civil war—America sends them.

There is a moral obligation to reject unjust foreign policy. Moral considerations of foreign policy are inevitable. We must decide whether we choose to use our foreign policy for good or evil. This means that we cannot evaluate morality by the ends if we use immoral means to achieve those ends.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 65, 2004

But this only shows why the role of morality is inscape-able. In prescribing how the state ought to act, even the *realpolitik* supporters must ultimately rely on some moral justification. Their idea of an appropriate foreign policy can be defended only by arguing that it is the best means of attaining some morally defensible end. If they want to adopt a foreign policy that "works," the question must be: works—to achieve what? They must explain why it is *right* for us to exert power and to create "spheres of influence." So these pragmatic "realists" latch on to the culturally dominant view of the good, and issue altruist platitudes: "America must use its strength to assure global harmony"—"We can't act entirely on our own because the world is an interdependent whole"—"A superpower will discharge its responsibilities by taking into account the needs of other nations"—"America should rule, but it must be willing to serve, too."

The philosophy of altruism guides all political parties in regards to foreign policy.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 10, 2004

Policymakers differ on the type of assistance to one provided, with liberals and conservatives arguing over whether it should be primarily economic or military in nature. But that is a dispute only about form. On the substantive question of whether another nation's need, for food or for weapons, creates a moral duty on our part to fulfill it, all parties answer affirmatively. They may at times invoke spurious claims of national self-interest to justify pouring American resources down a bottomless foreign-aid pit, but the true rationale is always the altruistic injunction to think of others before ourselves.

Governments must not try to bribe its enemies with humanitarian aid.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-Interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 22, 2004

Renounce appeasement. Appeasement is the pretense that there are no enemies, only latent allies ready to announce upon receipt of sufficient payment that their interests suddenly coincide with those of their bribers. So a Hitler is bought off with Czechoslovakia, on the premise that somehow it will no longer be in his "interests" to enslave Poland just as it is assumed that Yasser Arafat's "interests" once he is given autocratic reign over the (Gaza Strip and the West Bank, will somehow no longer include the bombing of babies and the cleansing of all Jewish blood from "Greater Palestine." There is no possibility of an equal exchange with those who can offer nothing but a promise to refrain from aggression. Appeasement is a pathetic strategy when used by a schoolboy to deal with the class bully; it is an absurd act of self-emasculatation when practiced by the world's superpower. The choice to be a criminal, or a dictator, is a choice about moral values and being showered with protection money will not persuade the recipient that his choice is wrong. It will not keep him from both taking your payment and engaging in his brutality, to the extent he feels he can get away with it. Contrary to the Marxist belief in economic determinism, material goods do not mold one's philosophy of life. And contrary to the pragmatist embrace of Machiavellianism, the only reliable allies are those that do not need to be bought i.e., those with common moral and political principles. A killer pointing a gun at you is not someone who shares your ends and who differs only in his choice of the means *by* which to earn a living. The only way to protect yourself from such physical threats, therefore, is by responding with overwhelming retaliatory force—*not* by speaking softly and carrying a big carrot.

Altruistic foreign policy requires self-sacrifice.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 10, 2004

The premise shaping our foreign policy is that we must sacrifice ourselves for the sake of weaker nations because self-interest cannot be the standard of our actions. Thus, if Africa needs money to deal with a medical crisis, America provides it. If Mexico needs another massive loan—America arranges it. If China needs nuclear technology—America furnishes it. If troops are needed in Kosovo to separate murderous ethnic clans, or in Somalia to neutralize some local warlord, or in Liberia to interpose themselves among the factions of a civil war—America sends them.

Altruistic foreign policy forces the governments to make moral compromises.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-Interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 11, 2004

The precept of self-sacrifice pertains not only to material goods, but to intellectual assets as well. Just as you are urged to hand over your money for the sake of others, so you are urged to surrender your *convictions* in the cause of altruism. Who are you to insist self-righteously on the truth of your viewpoint?—this precept demands. What about your opponent's viewpoint? Isn't one man's terrorist another man's freedom-fighter? You can't condemn any countries as part of an "axis of evil"; they probably think the same of you. Never believe that you know the truth—that is too self-confident. Never decide on your own to resort to force against other nations—that is too self-assured. Be flexible, negotiate, give in, give up.

Altruistic foreign policy is contrary to the founding ideals of our government.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 12-13, 2004

America is based on the recognition of each individual's right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This means that the government may not treat the citizen as a serf—i.e., as* someone who exists to serve the needs of others. Rather, each individual is a free, sovereign entity, entitled to live his own life for his own sake, no matter how loudly some people may wail about their need for his services. That is the meaning of inalienable rights. If a foreign aggressor threatens the rights of Americans, our government safeguards those rights by wielding retaliatory force so that its citizens can remain free—free to pursue the goals they have chosen to further their own lives.

Altruistic foreign policy leads to the loss of the rights of citizens.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-Interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 37, 2004

This moral self-doubt is so pervasive that the American government docilely agrees to restrict the freedom of its own citizens in order to pacify its terror-assisting "allies." for example, Saudi Arabia forbids the distribution of non-Wahhabi religious material and the U.S. government actively implements this oppression. The Postal Service is not allowed to deliver to American soldiers in Saudi Arabia any material, like a Bible, that is "offensive" to the religious authorities there. Similarly, the U.S. Consulate banned a Catholic mass on consular premises, in deference to Saudi sensibilities. In a further enforcement of religious controls, any female soldier in Saudi Arabia who tries to travel off-base in a vehicle that does not have a male escort doing the driving, with her ensconced in the back seat, is subject to punishment--by a U.S. court-martial (And these are soldiers who are in that country in order to protect the Saudis from attack by their neighbors.)

Voting for the Pro side would lead to chaos in foreign policy.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-Interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 65, 2004

The entire world thus becomes a tripwire. Anything can launch the State Department into agonized pondering over whether and how to react. Every thing is a potential Vietnam. We never know where to draw the line there is no objective line. The result is an ad hoc foreign policy, as incoherent as it is unpredictable, under which the State Department lurches from crisis to crisis, oscillating between a duty to meet the demands of altruism and an intermittent, self-assertive desire to resist those demands by upholding our interests but rarely knowing how this latter is to be accomplished.

Altruistic foreign policy increases threats of violence against governments.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 12, 2004

Invading a sovereign state—they feared—would have been selfish "unilateralism" on our part. Prior to the international support generated, temporarily, by September 11, Washington would not tolerate such drastic action. Who are we to kill others just because we think they threaten us? Shouldn't we have some empathy for people living in desperate straits? How can we ignore the world's disapproval? Shouldn't we try more diplomacy, so that both sides can air their grievances? And if that means increasing the risk to us—our policymakers cautioned—well, we can't be so parochially consumed with our own problems.

Altruistic foreign policy led to 9/11.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-Interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 11, 2004

While we do at times take military action in our defense, it is usually perfunctory, intended only to slap the offender on the wrist. The Clinton administration's 1998 bombing of a Sudanese pharmaceutical factory and an empty Afghani camp, in response to al Qaeda's deadly strike against two U.S. embassies in Africa, was typical (though that reprisal missed even the offender's wrist). Worst of all, we refuse to take action to *prevent* disaster. For example, regarding the basic threat posed by al Qaeda, there is nothing we learned on September 11, 2001, that we did not know years earlier. When our government knows about an Osama bin Laden who in 1998 declared a "holy war" in which Muslims were ordered to execute every American they could—a bin Laden whose al Qaeda organization has launched various attacks that have killed Americans since at least 1993—a bin Laden who was indicted by federal grand juries in 1996 and in 1998 for three such attacks—a bin Laden who has been on the FBI's list of Ten Most Wanted Fugitives since 1999—and a bin Laden whose terrorist activities are being sustained since 1996 by the government of Afghanistan—with all this information, the principle of self-interest should have mandated the forcible elimination of the Afghani regime, and of al Qaeda, well before September 11. But that principle is precisely what is absent among our self-doubting policymakers.

Aiding enemies sustains and strengthens them.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 59, 2004

"Engagement" with our enemies does not make them into friends; it only makes them into stronger enemies. It provides them with the moral sanction they do not deserve and with the material support they could not have generated themselves. "Engagement" with the Soviets sustained them for over half a century; engagement with North Korea has enabled it now to brandish nuclear weapons against us.

We must not aid enemy nations.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 59, 2004

The appropriate foreign policy toward such nations is the opposite of engagement: *ostracism*. Let these nations stand or, more accurately, fall on their own. We should stop sanctioning our own destroyers. We should stop helping them pretend they are moral, civilized nations. If they threaten us, the only message they merit is the same one that any domestic criminal ought to receive from the police: drop your weapons or you will be overwhelmed by force. The paradigm here is President Theodore Roosevelt's famous reaction in 1904 to the kidnapping of an American, Ion Perdicaris, in Morocco, by pirates led by Ahmed er Raisuli, Roosevelt's terse communiqué to the government of Morocco read: "We want either Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." There was no diplomatic "engagement," only the deployment of our naval fleet to Tangier—whereupon Perdicaris was quickly freed.

All foreign policy requires a philosophical basis.

Yaron Brook, "The Moral Foundations of Public Policy: A Series from the Ayn Rand Institute," The Foreign Policy of Self-Interest: A Moral Ideal for America, 2004

Critics of our foreign policy abound. Some cite tactical military blunders, while others lament diplomatic mistakes in this or that particular conflict. But the problem is far deeper. Foreign policy is neither a starting point nor a self-contained field. It is, rather, the product of certain ideas in political and moral philosophy. Without a solid foundation, no house can remain standing for long; similarly, without a rational intellectual base, no foreign policy can be effective in safeguarding the nation. Indeed, for precisely that reason, America's foreign policy has been an unmitigated disaster for decades. It has failed because of the bankrupt moral philosophy our political leaders have chosen to accept: the philosophy of altruism and self-sacrifice.

The correct standard for foreign policy is whatever keeps people free.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 13-14, 2004

In her system of ethics Ayn Rand presented not only a validation of self-interest as man's moral purpose, but also an analysis of what man's self-interest entails. She demonstrated that one's self-interest is achieved, not by "instinct" or by whim, but by acting in accord with the factual requirements of man's life, which means: by living as a rational being. Since the concept of self-interest pertains fundamentally to the individual, the idea of a nation's self-interest refers only to the political precondition of a person's living rationally in a social setting, which means: freedom. Without freedom, man cannot pursue the values his life demands. Just as in ethics it is maintaining his own life that should be the individual's ultimate purpose, in politics it is maintaining its own citizens* liberty that should be the government's ultimate purpose. Not the pragmatic, amoral goal of preserving a "balance of powder" or of establishing "spheres of influence"—but the moral goal of keeping Americans free. Freedom is the end to which all other political actions are the means. *This* is the standard by which a nation's interests ought to be measured—and this is where the science of foreign policy should begin.

Voting for the Con side is the only way to protect individual rights and autonomy.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 18, 2004

On the premise of individualism, however, government has a thoroughly different nature. Its purpose isn't to take from the individual what he has earned, but to ensure that he has the freedom to earn it, and to keep it. Its function is to ensure that the rights of the individual are inviolate. When it comes to foreign policy, therefore, such a government views the national self-interest—i.e., the protection of the citizen's freedom—as non-sacrificable. Just as it recognizes each individual's right to exist for his own sake, rather than in servitude to others, so it espouses the derivative right of every free nation to act solely for its own interests, rather than in deference to the demands of some international collective. It acts for itself, and it acts by its own judgment. It does not subordinate its interests to those of other nations, regardless of how plaintively those nations trumpet their alleged needs. It does not feel guilty for the riches Americans have created, nor for the power those riches have made possible. It refuses to allow the failures of other nations to establish a claim upon America's success. And it does not surrender its convictions in order to placate the enemies of liberty. It adopts a foreign policy, in other words, that is consistent with the philosophy of capitalism.

The lack of a clear determination of our self-interest prevents any real defense of it.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-Interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 13, 2004

This leads to the crucial question of what actually *constitutes* America's interests. The answer that State Department officials habitually offer amounts to: "There can be no confining rules about our interests; we have to go by whatever feels right at the lime." This is why even when they are trying to protect this country's interests, they fail dismally. Our policymakers lack an objective standard by which to judge whether a course of action does or does not advance America's interests.

A government's foreign policy should be as clearly written as the criminal code.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 16, 2004

The United States requires a scrupulously unambiguous foreign policy for exactly the same reason it needs a clear code of criminal law: *to make explicit the process of protecting the individual rights of Americans*. A criminal code defines the actions—murder, rape, theft, etc. — that deprive individuals of their freedom and that will elicit the use of retaliatory force by government in its citizens* defense. Similarly, an appropriate foreign policy identifies the actions by other states that will be considered threats to our freedom and that will be responded to by force.

Foreign policy that is neutral is unjust.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 20-21, 2004

Our State Department should rigorously judge the world's governments, by the standard of individual liberty, and make its conclusions public. Harmonious relations with all nations are not a goal of foreign policy— are, in fact, incompatible with America's fundamental goal. We only undermine our freedom when we welcome, or are neutral towards, its destroyers. The followers of Woodrow Wilson's amoral dictum, "No nation is fit to sit in judgment upon any other nation," are disastrously wrong. We should praise those who share our values and condemn those who do not—and act accordingly. This achieves the very practical purpose of telling the world that we take our ideals seriously enough to regard our enemies as ... enemies. It is when our antagonists are led to think their crimes will be readily tolerated by us when they are led to think that we operate on the pragmatic premise that our interests are somehow divorced from our moral values that our security is jeopardized. It is when they think we will never permit ourselves to be provoked into action that eventual armed conflict (or surrender) becomes inevitable. By being willing to judge others, we are expressing our commitment to the value of liberty.

We cannot appease our enemies and protect freedom.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-Interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 22-23, 2004

Do not sanction our destroyers. The existence of any widespread tyranny, from communism to Islamic terrorism, is not possible without the *moral* sanction of its victims. It was because so many in the West viewed communism as a "noble theory" that the Soviet Union was not boycotted economically and shunned politically. It was because the Soviet Union was treated as a civilized country, rather than as a brutal slaughterhouse, that it obtained from the West the means of fending off starvation and of procuring a military arsenal that endangered the world for so long. Similar moral concessions on the part of the victims have led to the growing threat of terrorism. We are often urged to avoid judging the guilty parties, especially the governments that sustain the terrorists, strictly by Western standards. We are told to empathize with those who are struggling for "self-determination," or with those who need to demonstrate solidarity with their Muslim brothers in their fight against American "imperialism," But if we hold freedom as an *objective* political standard, we cannot tolerate those who are acting to destroy it. We dare not say. "Well, their standards may be different from ours, but we must accept a diversity of viewpoints." We must treat them as an unqualified evil. Yet every time such destroyers are courteously invited to a State Department cocktail party or are permitted by us to preside over the Human Rights Commission at the United Nations America is granting them the imprimatur of a moral sanction.

A foreign policy of self-interest would not lead to constant war.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 15, 2004

It is true that the rise of freedom anywhere in the world benefits us. It eliminates potential enemies, it creates new allies in securing our own freedom against militaristic dictatorships and it generates new sources of economic production and trade. Consequently—the State Department's dogmatic worship of "stability" notwithstanding—we should always give moral support to any people who are fighting for freedom against an oppressive government. But this does not mean we ought to declare war on every tyrant in the world. Before we decide to wage war, there must exist a serious threat to our own freedom. Our government is not the world's policeman.

A foreign policy of self-interest would not lead to dictatorships.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 14, 2004

And this is the standard that would differentiate our foreign policy from that of a dictatorship. When people assert that a foreign policy based solely on protecting the United States against attack is devoid of moral content because, they say, even a totalitarian state employs its armies to defend its interests—they are ignoring this standard. They are dropping the context within which a nation's self-interest is defined. Keeping a leash around people's necks cannot be in their interests—but in a dictatorship the armed forces serve as that leash. Their function is to help maintain the condition of enslavement. In a free country, the military shields its citizens from subjugation. In a totalitarian state, however, it shields against the opposite. What the armies of a Nazi Germany, a Soviet Russia or a Taliban government in Afghanistan shield the citizen from is: liberation. Their armies keep their people in thrall. A dictatorship's foreign policy is essentially the same as its domestic policy. Both are intended not—as America's are—to uphold the citizen's rights, but to abrogate them. And what both achieve, therefore, is not self-interest but self-destruction. Only a nation that enshrines freedom can adopt a foreign policy that is actually based on self-interest.

A foreign policy of self-interest would reject nationalism.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 19, 2004

This individualist approach to foreign policy disavows any¹-form of nationalism. Nationalism is a collectivist idea, which regards the nation as the primary unit of life and which holds that the citizen is obligated to devote his energies to the glorification of whatever state happens to declare him its subject. But under a foreign policy of rational self-interest, it is the *individual* who is the primary unit, and it is the maintenance of his liberty that is the government's sole mission. Genuine self-interest requires limiting the state's power for the purpose of upholding individual rights—in contrast to nationalism, which calls for suppressing individual rights for the purpose of expanding the state.

The foreign policy of self-interest rejects blanket multilateralism and unilateralism.

Peter Schwartz, co-founder of the Global Business Network, The Foreign Policy of Self-Interest: A Moral Ideal for America, p. 19-20, 2004

This approach also rejects the specious concepts of "unilateralism" and "multilateralism" as guidelines in foreign policy. Instead, the government is guided strictly by the goal of protecting its citizens* freedom—which it attains sometimes by acting alone and sometimes by acting in concert with other nations (assuming, of course, that their cooperation is not gained at the cost of adulterating the goal). It is only a collectivist philosophy that attaches moral virtue to coalition-cobbling. As is true of an individual's pursuit of self-interest, the crucial issue here is not the number of actors involved, but the nature of the goal. And under a proper foreign policy, the choice of whether to act alone or with other nations like the choice of whether to invade Afghanistan only with Marines or to include the Army, Navy and Air Force -depends entirely on which is the more practical , method of achieving the objective that *America judges* is valid.

Germany's acceptance of refugees demonstrates how unlimited gestures to help refugees are altruistic and weakens the government.

The Economist, Merkel at her limit, Oct. 10, 2015, www.economist.com/news/europe/21672296-after-historic-embrace-refugees-german-public-opinion-turning-merkel-her-limit

On the night of September 4th Angela Merkel made the most dramatic decision of her decade as German chancellor: to suspend European asylum rules and allow tens of thousands of refugees stranded in Hungary to enter Germany via Austria. It was a moral gesture that fitted the mood of the moment. As The Economist went to press, Mrs Merkel was considered a favourite to win the Nobel Peace Prize. In Germany, however, that altruistic embrace has caused a backlash that could weaken a chancellor so far considered all but invincible.

Germany proves that once a government's national interests give way to refugee needs, the country will be flooded with refugees.

The Economist, Merkel at her limit, Oct. 10, 2015, www.economist.com/news/europe/21672296-after-historic-embrace-refugees-german-public-opinion-turning-merkel-her-limit

The numbers are dramatic. More than 200,000 migrants are believed to have arrived in Germany in September alone. For the year, official forecasts had already risen in August from 450,000 to 800,000. This week Bild, Germany's largest tabloid, cited estimates that the number could reach 1.5m—equivalent to the population of Munich. New refugees keep pouring in, and those granted asylum have the right to bring family later. No end is in sight.

Prioritizing the needs of refugees over national interests means many refugees' needs won't actually be met and increases violent crimes.

The Economist, Merkel at her limit, Oct. 10, 2015, www.economist.com/news/europe/21672296-after-historic-embrace-refugees-german-public-opinion-turning-merkel-her-limit

Processing centres exceeded capacity weeks ago. Local authorities are struggling to find housing, since temporary tent cities will not suffice in winter. The government of Hamburg has begun seizing empty office buildings to house refugees, raising constitutional questions. Berlin and Bremen are considering similar measures. Schools are struggling to integrate refugee children who speak no German. Fights have broken out inside overcrowded asylum centres, often between young men of different ethnic or religious groups. There have been more arson attacks on migrant centres. In Dresden, a xenophobic movement called Pegida is growing again: about 9,000 protested this Monday against refugees.

Pro Blocks

A/T Terrorism

1. **This argument is racist:** Just because people are from a foreign country and trying to get into another country doesn't mean they are terrorists.
2. **This argument doesn't apply to this topic:** the topic isn't necessarily about letting anybody into a country. National governments can provide for refugees humanitarian needs by providing aid to other countries that are accepting refugees. Governments don't actually have to accept refugees into their country to prioritize the needs of refugees.
3. Even if a country were to accept refugees, this doesn't mean background checks would go away: A government could decline to accept a refugees who are known terrorist.
4. The likelihood of refugees being terrorists is so incredibly low: this topic asks whether governments should help provide for humanitarian, or basic, needs of refugees. This is food, water, and shelter. If refugees are unable to provide for their own, they're very unlikely going to be able to stage a massive terrorist attack.

Pro Blocks

A/T Role of Government is to Protect Rights

1. This argument cuts against them: the basic human rights of refugees to food water and shelter. Thus, more rights are protected by prioritizing the needs of refugees.
2. The citizens of a government consent to their rights being sacrificed for the greater good when they organize in a government.
3. There's no impact to the minor loss of rights of some people, but even if there are, the benefits of providing for basic needs of other people outweigh.

Pro Blocks

A/T Altruistic Foreign Policy

1. This argument is not unique because most governments already have a form of altruistic foreign policy. For example, the US gives humanitarian aid to lots of countries for various things. Helping refugees is not much different from humanitarian aid.
2. This argument is not unique because most national governments have altruistic domestic policies. For examples, national governments have social welfare programs. The US has Medicaid and housing programs designed to assist the poor. If the domestic policy is altruistic, then the impacts of having an altruistic foreign policy should already be occurring locally.
3. Finally, this arguments works against them, because governments have altruistic domestic policies, then having altruistic foreign policy promotes consistency in the government, which is a reason to have an altruistic foreign policy.

Pro Blocks

A/T Can't provide for refugees needs.

1. Some countries do have the resources, technology, and infrastructure to help solve the refugee crisis.

Adrienne Clarkson, Opinion-Editorial, The New York Times, October 7, 2015, www.nytimes.com/2015/10/08/opinion/adrienne-clarkson-canada-knows-how-to-respond-to-a-refugee-crisis.html

Canadian immigration officials could be sent out once again to places like Kos and Lesvos to help screen and approve refugees. Canada is a country that aims to accept 350,000 people — 1 percent of its population — each year as immigrants and future citizens. Canada knows how to handle refugee crises, and we can show others how to do it better. We have retired immigration officers who would likely jump at the chance to offer their experience to German and Swedish officials struggling to manage this horrendous crisis. They could train their counterparts in European countries to assess and process refugees on site in Turkey so that families like the Kurdis don't have to risk their lives and have part of their families drown. This would ease the rush to borders and help to bring some organization to what is now total chaos. With all the technology that is now available we should be able to process, identify and place refugees much more easily than we did in 1979.

2. A government can alter other policies when accepting refugees; this can also lead to more public sector jobs.

The Economist, Merkel at her limit, Oct. 10, 2015, www.economist.com/news/europe/

In response Mrs Merkel's government is scrambling to make changes. It has passed legislation that cuts pocket money to refugees, currently €143 (\$160) a month, and replaces it with vouchers. More police and administrators are being hired. All Balkan countries have been declared "safe" so that their asylum applicants can be rejected and deported faster. On October 6th Mrs Merkel took charge of co-ordinating refugee policy, in effect demoting the interior minister, Thomas de Maizière.

Con Blocks

A/T Governments can provide aid rather than accept refugees.

1. This topic is not about providing humanitarian aid to other countries. The current crisis is that refugees have no where to go and thus whether a national government should relax its refugee standards to allow more refugees into their country.
2. There's no guarantee that the other countries will use the funding for refugees. Thus, giving aid to other countries doesn't necessarily help refugees.

Con Blocks

A/T Refugees will contribute.

1. If the purpose of having the refugees is to promote the nation's interest, then their argument doesn't require a nation to prioritize refugees' needs over national interests.
2. The topic anticipates that refugees do not have their basic humanitarian needs met now. If they cannot provide for their own needs, then they will not be able to provide for the needs of others.
3. Even if refugees can contribute over the long term, then their benefits have no timeframe because we don't know exactly at what point in the future refugees will start contributing.

Con Blocks

A/T People are in need.

1. People are always in need; that doesn't mean that every government should sacrifice its countries own interests to help those people in need. The reason why refugees are in need is because Syria and other war torn countries did not act in their citizens' best interests. This is not a good policy standard to follow.

2. Governments can still help those people in need so long as it promotes the national interests. For example, if accepting some refugees would help the nation's economic sector, then the government should provide for the needs of refugees.

Con Blocks

A/T Our souls and integrity are on the line.

1. There's no evidence that our souls or integrity will be impacted by not accepting every refugee that needs help into the country.
2. The impact of loss of integrity does not outweigh the harms of engaging in blindly altruistic foreign policy.
3. Our souls and integrity are on the line if we advocate that our government hurt itself, and its current efforts to help people, to take on a new effort to help people.

PRO CASE #1
PREFLOW

1) National government are actors: the topic says “a government” and asks whether that government should prioritize refugees over national interest.

2) Accepting refugees is not in nation’s interest

The thesis of our case is that although the short term provision of basic needs to refugees results in long-term gains that justify a national government prioritizing the basic needs of refugees over its immediate national interests

First, despite the initial strain on national resources, helping refugees can help them integrate into society to fulfill their dreams of becoming doctors and lawyers. Amr 2013

Second, the refugee crisis is destabilizing smaller nations. When a government’s neighbors are destabilized, this does not promote a national interest. Amr

Third, Canada proves national governments can help solve the refugee crisis. Clarkson 2015

PRO CASE #2
PREFLOW

1) Topic is about refugee crisis;
can be Syria

2) National government are
actors: the topic says “a
government” and asks whether
that government should prioritize
refugees over national interest.

3) the resolution does not
specify how a government must
prioritize the needs of refugees.

The thesis of our case is that
millions of refugee children are
in need, and governments have
an obligation to help them.

**First, the refugee crisis is
tearing families apart. Amr
2013:**

**Second, the refugee crisis is
causing hundreds of thousands
of people physical and mental
harms. Amr 2013**

**Third, governments can
provide for the needs of
refugee children. Amr 2013**

CON CASE #1
PREFLOW

The resolution requires a national government to harm its interests for the benefit of non-citizens.

The thesis of our case is that creates a foreign policy of altruism that must be rejected.

First, altruistic foreign policy has led to repeated disasters.
Schwartz 2003

Second, an altruistic foreign policy promotes dictatorships and strengthens the forces opposing freedom. Schwartz 2003

Finally, only foreign policy of self-interest can check back the evil of altruistic foreign policy. Governments must embrace an all-encompassing foreign policy of self-interest. Schwartz 03

CON CASE #2
PREFLOW

The thesis of our case is accepting refugees results in rights violations of a nation's citizens. A government should protect, not violate the rights of its citizens.

First, prioritizing the needs of refugees over national interests means many refugees' needs won't actually be met and increases violent crimes. The Economist 2015

Second, a foreign policy of self-interest would protect rights. Schwartz 2003

Finally, voting Con is the only way to protect individual rights and autonomy. Schwartz continues

**THE PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE:
GUIDELINES FOR SUCCESS
(2D EDITION)**

By The Forensics Files

THE PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE: GUIDELINES FOR SUCCESS

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
The First Two Speeches (A1 & B1).....	4-8
The First Crossfire (A1 & B1).....	9-10
The Second Two Speeches (A2 & B2).....	11-14
The Second Crossfire (A2 & B2).....	15
Summary Speeches (A1 & B1).....	16-19
The Grand Crossfire (All).....	20
Final Speeches (A2 & B2).....	21-23
Preparation Time.....	24-25
Judge Adaptation.....	26-28
Speech Times.....	29
Glossary.....	30-31

INTRODUCTION TO THIS EDITION

This is our first major update to this textbook since it was first drafted in 2006–2007. The rule changes permitting the Final Focus speech to be two minutes long instead of one minute, as well as the evolution of the activity over the past few years, prompted us to make some updates and additions to the book. In large part, the book is the same. But we have made some important updates regarding what debaters should be expecting and what has succeeded in debater. We hope this book will be as helpful to you as it has been helpful to the purchasers of the previous version of this book. We thank you for your ordering this product and if you have any comments, questions, or suggestion for a third edition, please [let us know!](#)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Public Forum debate (PF Debate or PFD) is still a relatively new type of debate that has been added to many high school forensics tournaments. It has undergone many changes over the years. For example, PFD has also been called Crossfire, Controversy, and Ted Turner debate. In addition to PFD, there are other types of debate, including Cross-Examination debate (CX or policy debate), and Lincoln-Douglas debate (LD or value debate). These formats of debate are very technique-oriented and specialized. For instance, if a layperson (someone who has never seen the event before) were to watch a CX or LD debate, he or she may not understand or know how to evaluate (or even understand) the round in the same way a former debater would. And that is partially the reason that PFD was created and adopted by many schools and programs throughout the country as an alternative that would in community members who would be interested in the topic and who could judge the debate without regard to the technicalities of CX or LD.

Conversely, public forum debate is more accessible to the average person and students who want to join debate without having to learn all the intricacies of cross-examination or Lincoln-Douglas debate. PFD also tends to emphasize presentation, style, and persuasion, whereas the other types, CX and LD, are very argument-based. In some cases in those types of debates, the less persuasive or less sophisticated debater will win based on argumentation despite their poor presentation. Moreover, the topic for PFD debate changes from month to month, whereas in CX debate, the same topic is debated year-round. In LD, the topic changes every two months

At the beginning of each PF debate the teams will flip a coin. The winner of the coin toss can either choose which side they want to debate or to speak first or second. If the winning team chooses a side, the other team gets to choose if they want to go first or second. Unlike CX and LD debate, in which the affirmative team always presents first, the Pro side or the Con side may present first in PFD.

The following provides guidelines and techniques for what should be done during each speech, crossfire, and during preparation time. We hope that it is useful in providing a better understanding of PFD and promotes the success of the debaters who follow the guidelines.

CHAPTER 2

THE FIRST TWO SPEECHES

Because the side that initiates the debate may differ from round to round, both of the first two speeches set up and establish the arguments that will be debated the rest of the round for each side. This initial establishment of arguments is referred to as the **case**. Each of these two speeches is four minutes in duration. During this set of speeches both sides should develop several arguments, which could, potentially, win the debate round.

There are at least two persuasive and strategic ways to set up and build your case. The first consists of a logical syllogism. You can learn more about logical syllogisms in our other book: *Introduction to High School Debate and Logic*. But for purposes of this book, a syllogism is two connected premises and one conclusion. Take the following for example under the October 2011 space exploration topic:

Resolved: Private sector investment in human space exploration is preferable to public sector investment.

A syllogism-type case could be set up as follows with the preferred outcome being the conclusion:

- A. One system of space exploration is preferable to the other if it more efficiently uses financial resources.
- B. The public sector uses financial resources in space exploration more efficient manner than the private sector.
 - 1. The public sector efficiently uses public sector resources because it is constrained by the public vote whereas the private sector is not so constrained.
 - 2. The private sector is not sufficiently regulated and will cause more disasters and wastes of resources than government exploration would.

You can see the strength of this type of case. If A and B are both true, then what is the conclusion? More concretely, if one type of investment is preferable to the other because it is more efficient, and if the public sector is more efficient than the private sector, it

must be true that, “Public sector investment in human space exploration is *not* preferable to the private sector.” Thus, this Con case should win you the debate, assuming you can defend it. But that’s a big assumption. You have to answer the Pro case as well and defend the Pro’s attacks against your case. For example, what if the Pro side proved that the private sector was more efficient? Well then you’d probably lose. But your objective is to persuade the judge so make an argument why the Pro side says the opposite; don’t just let the other team get away with making an argument without questioning them about it or at least challenging it.

Another common and strategic type of case is the shotgun approach. It is a series of independent reasons why the resolution is true. In drafting this type of case, each of these arguments should be independent of the others. Essentially, the arguments should vary in regards to the major claims to diversify the arguments being made and to avoid repetition. The type of case you might prefer will depend largely on the resolution.

Consider the April 2011 Organ Donation resolution

Resolved: The United States federal government should permit the use of financial incentives to encourage organ donation.

A shotgun case could be the following:

- A. Organ donation saves lives from organ failure.
- B. Organ donation improves the economic market.
- C. Organ donation prevents organ harvesting.
- D. Organ donation prevents disease spread.

Every one of the different arguments should be developed enough to independently win the debate round. This will be vital to maintaining a strategy throughout the debate with this type of case. However, like the syllogism case, the shotgun approach has its weaknesses as well. For instance, what if the Con side proves that government financial

incentives *decrease* organ donation, say perhaps by discouraging generous donations that are not motivated by profit? Then in that case you'd probably lose. But if you ever run a case that you think is bulletproof and can never lose, then you're wrong. There's always a way to beat a case. And in PFD, that is much easier where the case is sometimes secondary to *how you present* your case.

But back to the structure of PFD. To begin, the A1 speaker should develop two to five main points. Similarly, the B1 speaker should do the same. It is important to keep in mind that the quality of arguments should be balanced with the quantity of arguments made. For example, two well-developed, warranted arguments would be preferable to five underdeveloped arguments. The first reason to balance quality and quantity would be because a large number of weak arguments will also not be very persuasive to most judges. On the other hand, one strong argument would allow the other side to spend more time arguing against that one point. The second reason to limit the number of arguments would be to prevent the need to speak rapidly or unclearly. Because the first speeches are the foundations for both sides' arguments for the rest of the debate, they should be as understandable and as clear as possible.

Ideally, both of the first two speeches should make two to five arguments. This would allow time for brief introductions and conclusions as well as about a minute to develop each argument made. Remember, each argument should be independent of the others if you are running a shotgun case or each argument should tightly flow together if you are running syllogism type case. Just keep in mind the strengths of the type of case you are running.

Each argument in your case could and sometimes should include the following:

1. *Claim*: a statement that, if true, supports or negates the resolution.
2. *Warrant*: a reason to believe that the claim is true.
3. *Evidence*: a quote from a newspaper, magazine, or journal article, book, etc., that supports the claim and/or warrant.
4. *Qualifications*: what makes the author of that article credible or qualified to make arguments concerning the topic?
5. *Conclusion*: why the argument supports/negates the resolution.

For the purpose of explanation, the following resolution will be used as a reference to explain the essentials of an argument in Public Forum debate: *Resolved: Student aptitude should be assessed through standardized testing.* An example of a strong argument would be as follows:

“Standardized testing is not an effective measure of aptitude (1) because they only test logical and linguistic intelligences (2). Aptitude is defined by the American Heritage Dictionary in 2000 as ‘an inherent ability, as for learning; a talent.’ An article entitled A Rounded Version by Howard Gardner, a professor of human development at the Harvard Graduate School of Learning (4), illustrates this point. ‘Two eleven-year-old children are taking a test... They record their answers by filling in small circles on a single piece of paper... These completed answer sheets are scored objectively: the number of right answers is converted into a standardized score...In this society we are nearly ‘brain-washed’ to restrict the notion of intelligence to the capacities used in solving logical and linguistic problems...Are the chess player, violinist, and athlete not ‘intelligent’ in these pursuits? If they are, why do our tests of ‘intelligence’ fail to identify them? If not, what allows them to achieve such astounding feats?” (3). Because

standardized testing does not measure all types of aptitude it is not effective measure of aptitude (5).”

The *claim* in this passage is: “Standardized testing is not an effective measure of aptitude.” The *warrant*, or reason to believe this claim is: “because they only test logical and linguistic intelligences.” The *evidence* is the selection from an article suggesting that standardized testing accounts for only logical and linguistic aptitude, and does not sufficiently measure aptitude in other activities such as sports, strategizing, and music. The *qualification* of the author is that he is a professor of education at Harvard graduate school. This would qualify the author to make claims about current testing and other aspects of aptitude. Finally, the *conclusion* (5) explicitly states how this argument negates the resolution. When read aloud, this passage would only take 45 to 50 seconds to read at a conversational pace. Coupled with two or three other main arguments, an introduction and conclusion, this argument would be part of the first ‘con’ or negative speech.

When **flowing** the first two speeches, it might be helpful to flow them on separate sheets of paper. This is illustrated by the tables on the next page.

Table (Paper) I: The Con/Negative Flow

A1 (Con)			
<p>Introduction:</p> <p>Main Arguments</p> <p>1. Standardized tests only measure logical and linguistic aptitude. -Gardner of Harvard 'other kinds of intelligences exist that standardized test' -standardized testing is not effective because it does not take into account other aspects of aptitude</p> <p>2. Major argument #2 -Evidence -Conclusion</p> <p>3. Major argument #3 -Evidence -Conclusion</p> <p>Formal conclusion</p>			

Table (Paper) II: The Pro/Affirmative Flow

B1 (Pro)			
<p>Introduction:</p> <p>1. Major argument #1 -Evidence -Conclusion</p> <p>2. Major argument #2 -Evidence -Conclusion</p> <p>3. Major argument #3 -Evidence -Conclusion</p> <p>Final Conclusion:</p>			

After the first two speeches, you should have two sheets of paper resembling the previous tables. Assuming that the Con side decided to go first, this is the order in which you should have the arguments written down, or flowed. The reasons for taking notes, or flowing, on the first two speeches on two separate sheets of paper in this way will be further explained in the sections below. Both of the first two speeches should be prepared before the debate round. What we mean by this is that if you are the Pro side, you should have the arguments from your case flowed. And if you are the Con side, you should have the same. We do not mean that you should flow the other team's case before the round. Following the first two speeches, the two debaters that gave speeches will ask each other questions for clarification and/or to reestablish their arguments.

One word of caution: because there is no required content of any speech, many debaters who are speaking second will take, what we think, is an improper approach. They will use their first speech to respond to arguments you made in your first speech. Why do we think this is wrong? For two reasons: First, the cases set the arguments for the rest of the round. All you will do for the rest of the debate is answer to and respond to the arguments presented in the first couple of speeches. If the second team speaking responds prematurely to the arguments of the first team speaking, then the arguments will have been prematurely answered and the debate will seem like the debaters are "beating a dead horse" or in other words just repeating themselves. Second, and as a transition to the next chapter, you will start to fight your points out during crossfire.

But just because logic suggests that the first two speeches should present only the teams cases, rather than responses to the other team's cases, this does not mean people

will follow logic or that it is “against the rules.” It’s just bad practice, and you should be aware that it exists.

CHAPTER 3

THE FIRST CROSSFIRE

The first crossfire is when speakers A1 and B1 ask each other questions to clarify their arguments to each other. Because speaker B1 just finished his/her speech, speaker B1 should allow A1 to have the first question. When asking questions, it is important that each question is clear and concise. For example, a good question would be, “Could you please clarify what you mean by the phrase...?” Longer questions can lead to confusion and be more easily avoided by answering the question with another question to clarify the original question. For example, after being asked a question with a lengthy preface, the answering debater may respond, “Could you rephrase your question?” or “What do you mean by...?”

There are generally three types of questions one could ask in crossfire: (1) a yes/no question, (2) an either/or question, or (3) an open-ended question. Most questions asked tend to be open-ended questions for clarification purposes. However, some debaters have the habit of ‘dragging on’ in answering questions and using up crossfire time by interjecting unnecessary comments. If this tends to be the case in a particular debate, it might be more effective to ask yes/no or either/or questions.

Guidelines for Crossfire

1. Be polite. Refrain from being sarcastic, rude, or condescending in asking questions or answering them. Being rude is often looked down upon by judges, and might cause you to lose credibility or favor.
2. Do not dominate the crossfire period. Let your opponent ask questions and allow them sufficient time to answer the questions you ask. Do not cut them off before you give them enough time to answer your question.
3. Do not take too long of a time to answer your opponent’s question.

4. In the first edition we recommended that the debaters stand up and face the judge when participating in crossfire. Our rationale was that debate is about persuading the judge, *not* the other team. While our rationale is the same, we have seen it done persuasively for debaters to sit down and face each other. However, when it was done effectively, the debaters would face each other, ***but frequently make eye contact*** with the judge. Moreover, with regarding to sitting or standing, we believe a good rule is to do what your opponent is doing. If your opponent is sitting, don't stand up. If your opponent is standing, stand up. Odds are that the judge is going to think that one team is behaving weirdly while the other is not. You have a 50% chance that, based on the judge's preference, it would be your team. Don't flip coins unless the rules say you have to.
5. Only ask questions that pertain to the debate. Irrelevant questions waste time and damage debater's credibility.
6. Take turns asking and answering each other's questions. Do not ask a bunch of questions one after another. You want the judge to perceive you as attempting to be fair in sharing crossfire time with the other debater. A standard way of doing this, is to ask a question after you are done answering the one you have been asked. For example, you might want to say, "Now that I have answered your question..." then continue to ask your own question. We would no recommend that you probably want to err on the side of asking more questions rather than few questions. You don't want to be perceived as a bully, but you do want to be perceived as having more control than the other team. Struggle with the other team for asking a majority of the questions, but we'd say 3/4s of the questions would be a little too much.
7. Try to stay calm even if the debate is intense; it does not look professional to get angry or mad at the other debater in crossfire.
8. Wrap it up once time is over. Try to conclude your sentence as soon as possible. Avoid asking questions right before crossfire time has expired. The judge probably does not want to be there longer than you may want them to stay. But they are adults (preferably community members under the goals of PFD) with

other things to do than having to watch high schoolers arguing outside of the time limits.

9. Remember to ask clear and concise questions!
10. Be as honest and as clear as possible when answering questions. Do not try to mislead your opponents.
11. Don't ask a question and then answer it to make an argument. For example, don't say, "Did you make that argument? No!" However, it can be very effective to ask the question, "You didn't make that argument, did you?" With PFD, there is much to be said for form, a not much (well, probably bad things to say), about appearing obnoxious and rude.

Even though you should not flow the clarifications made in the crossfire period, it is important to pay attention to the questions and answers during that period to possibly pick up on what arguments the other side might make in their next speech and to make sure you completely understand their arguments.

Chapter 4 **The Second Two Speeches**

The purpose of these two speeches should be (remember the discussion above that there are no set rules) to refute the other side's arguments made in the first set of speeches. The side that gave the first speech of the first two speeches will give the first speech of the second two speeches. During this speech, speaker A2 should address the main arguments made by speaker B1. Typically, speaker A2 should make at least one to three arguments against each of the points made by speaker B1, if possible. Remember that quality should be balanced with quantity. The team responding to the other side's arguments could use this opportunity to **cross-apply** his/her team's main points from the first speech to respond to the opponent's argument.

It is very important that each point made by the other side is refuted, otherwise the argument is **dropped**. This means that, because the argument was not addressed, it should be assumed to be true by both sides of the debate. If one side does not answer the argument, then the assumption that both sides agree that an argument is true is therefore fair. If there are no arguments made in the first possible chance to make those arguments, then in the next speech there is nothing for the other side to refute. Having these assumptions give both sides an equal chance to make, develop, and defend their arguments. For example, if a team does not answer an argument in one of the four-minute speeches, and then refutes the argument in their two-minute speech. This leaves the other side with only two minutes to respond to the arguments, instead of the four minutes allotted in the first set of speeches.

The following flow demonstrates what a dropped argument would look like.

The dropped argument is boxed on the flow. This argument is considered dropped because the other side did not make any refutations against the argument (notice that there are not direct refutations of that specific argument).

A1	B2		
Main Argument #1 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #2 -Evidence -Conclusion <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; width: fit-content;"> Main Argument #3 -Evidence -Conclusion </div> Main Argument #4 -Evidence -Conclusion	1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3 4. Refutation #4 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3		

In making the arguments in the second set of speeches, it is important to remember the rules for making arguments from the first set of speeches, such having a balance between the quantity and the quality of arguments made. Another important thing to remember is to save enough time to address all the arguments to ensure that all the arguments made by the other side are answered. This concept is called **time allocation**. For instance, the second speakers might want to mentally allocate the amount of time spent on each argument in the following way: spend one minute refuting their first argument, thirty seconds answering their second argument, forty-five seconds making arguments against their third argument, and one minute and thirty seconds answering the last argument. One might even want to write this time on their flow prior to giving their speech. The debaters would want to allocate time based on a few factors:

1. Strength of the other side's argument
2. The complexity of the other side's argument.
3. The number of arguments you want to make.
4. The explanation you will have to give to your arguments.
5. Evidence used to refute the other sides arguments.

The fifth factor brings up an important issue: the use of evidence in the second set of speeches. Because any team participating will have an equal chance of debating both sides of the topic, each team should have research both supporting (Pro side) and negating (Con side) the resolution. In addition to researching arguments supporting and negating the resolution, debaters should research arguments answering the main pro arguments and arguments answering the main con arguments prior to the debates.

In addition to this research, the debaters should develop, and write down, a list of arguments they would make if they heard a certain argument. The evidence found answering the other side's main arguments should be incorporated into these lists. These lists are commonly referred to in cross-examination and Lincoln Douglas debates as a **block**. This will decrease the amount of preparation time needed to be used before the second set of two speeches, as well as allows the debaters to already know the arguments they are going to make. This will also help with time allocation in the second two speeches. The concept of time allocation is illustrated by the flow below.

A1	B2		
Main Argument #1 -Evidence -Conclusion	(45 Seconds) 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2		
Main Argument #2 -Evidence -Conclusion	(1:30 minutes) 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3 4. Refutation #4		
Main Argument #3 -Evidence -Conclusion	(45 seconds) 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2		
Main Argument #4 -Evidence -Conclusion	(1 minute) 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3		

A block might resemble the following:

(Block answering the argument that affirmative action or using race is unfair.)

They argue that using race in admissions is unfair. I have three arguments in response-

1. The main purpose of affirmative action is to make admissions fairer. It's unfair for disadvantaged racial minorities to compete with privileged white students.
2. Using race as a deciding factor in admissions wouldn't be the only consideration for admissions. The resolution only requires me to defend adding race to the decision calculus of admitting students, not defend race as the only factor. Thus, it would still be competitive and fair because other academic standards would still apply.
3. Without affirmative action the number of racial minorities admitted into schools would decrease. Sylvia A Law, a professor of Law, Medicine and Psychiatry, at NYU Law School, in an article titled, "White Privilege and Affirmative Action" in the Akron Law Review in 1999 writes, "The fairness of admission practices to educational opportunities and employment opportunities raise profound questions. Personal and professional connections always weigh heavy. It is difficult to see this as wrong. We all trust the judgments of people we know and expect others to respect our judgments about people who we know well...But Black people have less access to this old boys, and increasingly old girls, network than white people."

Chapter 5

The Second Crossfire

You're in luck because this chapter is relatively short. The function of the second crossfire is similar to that of the first. It is a time for the other two debaters not involved in the first crossfire to ask each other questions about the speeches that were just given. The purpose of this crossfire is to clarify what arguments were made and to make sure all the arguments were recorded. It might be difficult to catch all the arguments made during the past two speeches; thus, this crossfire could be used to go over the missed arguments. Because this crossfire period is very similar to the first, the guidelines for cross-fire are the same.

Chapter 6 The Summary Speeches

The summary speeches are the speeches where the debate should condense or get smaller to just a few arguments. In the first summary speech, the side that initiated the debate will begin. During this speech the first of the two speakers should address their team's flow. For example, the debater should extend, or repeat, about two of the main arguments from their team's first speech.

A quick note on “repeating yourself”: It is *almost always bad* to repeat yourself in your own speech. For example, if you repeat yourself four times in your first speech this is a waste of time and it will make you look foolish in front of your judge. However—and this is important an important distinction—repeating what you have previously said in previous speech is *almost always a good thing*. This is because it impresses upon the mind of the judge your main and best arguments in the debate in a subtle way that does not smack them in the face in the same way as repeating yourself four times in one debate. But remember, if you repeat what you said in your first speech in a summary speech, don't repeat that argument several times in your summary speech. Limit yourself to stating one argument only one time per speech, but make a point to make your best argument *at least* one time. In sum, repeat your strongest argument one time and only one time in each speech.

In extending the main and strongest arguments from a case, it is the debater's obligation to extend the argument (re-explaining the argument) and respond to the other team's refutations of that argument. The debater might want to phrase this in the following way, “Refer back to our second main argument that...<explain the argument>

(1). They argued that...<briefly reference their argument> (2), but...<respond to their refutations> (3).” These steps are described by the flows below.

A1	B2	A1		
Main Argument #1 -Evidence -Conclusion	1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2	Extend-#1 (explanation of #1) 1. 1. Response to argument 1 (2,3) 2. Response to argument 2 (2,3)		
Main Argument #2 -Evidence -Conclusion	1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3 4. Refutation #4			
Main Argument #3 -Evidence -Conclusion	1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2	Extend #3 (explanation of #3) 1 1. Response to argument #1; 2,3 2. Response to argument #2; 2,3		
Main Argument #4 -Evidence -Conclusion	1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3			

Because the speeches are only two minutes long, there is not enough time to extend and expand upon all of the original arguments, as well as respond to the refutations made by the other side. Extending the specific arguments is important so that the judge knows which argument is being extended. Extending an argument should involve the following: (1) restating the claim, (2) briefly re-explaining the warrant, (3) reference the author of the evidence that supports the argument. Next, the debater should respond to ALL of the other side’s refutations of their argument. The same principle of dropped argument applies in the speech as well. If the debater does not answer all of the arguments, then the other argument(s) not answered should be assumed to be true by all participants in the debate.

Another thing to keep in mind is to be brief when referencing the other side’s arguments. Because there is less time in the summary speeches than the prior speeches, it will be necessary that there is not much description of the other team’s arguments. Time

used to characterize their arguments trades off with the amount of time to respond to those arguments. It also has the potential to clarify their arguments that were unclear to the judge when the other team was explaining it. This would benefit the other team who was being unclear when making their arguments, if that were the case. Take the following as a *bad example*:

“They said ... hmmm, it was something about using race in school admissions, hold on... let me find it on my flow ... ummm, yeah it was that schools should consider race in their admissions because, well, they used a specific term for it, I’m trying to remember what it is ... oh, yeah, it was affirmative action! They said that affirmative action is good because ... oh let me see on my flow, Oh yeah, it gives preference to some races over another to compensate for class-based inequalities. Well, I have an argument in response to that, it’s that, well, you see, not all people of a race are part of the same class. There are rich and poor white people, rich and poor Hispanic people, and rich and poor black people, etcetra. So there argument is false.”

The above example is a *bad example* because it is an unbelievably inefficient way to refer to an argument. Sometimes your flow is your worst enemy: and those “sometimes” are when you use it as a crutch. Don’t write stuff down and forget about it. Also, you don’t need to be 100% technically accurate in your speech. If you don’t remember the specialized word the other team used, don’t worry trying to find it on your when you can explain the concept in general terms. The next example is a *better example* than the one above:

“The other team supports considering race in admissions, reasoning that this make up for economic inequalities. But there are people within all racial categories that are

rich and others within that same category that are poor. So I wouldn't say looking to race is good substitute for economic class, would you?"

The Second Summary Speech

The team that gives the second summary speech has a slightly different responsibility in the summary speech. Because the other side has already extended their main arguments that they might be going for in the last speech, it is necessary that the debater giving the second summary speech extend refutations made against those arguments in the summary speech. This should be done after extending their main arguments from their case to make sure that the original arguments are extended; winning only refutations of their arguments (defense) makes it difficult to win the debate because those refutations are typically not reasons why the judge should vote that the resolution is true or false. A flow from a second summary speech should look like the following:

The Negative (Con) Flow

A1	B2	A1	B1	
Main Argument #1 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #2 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #3 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #4 -Evidence -Conclusion	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 10px;">1. Refutation #1</div> 2. Refutation #2 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3 4. Refutation #4 <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 10px;">1. Refutation #1</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 10px;">2. Refutation #2</div> 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3	Extend-#1 (explanation of #1) 1. Response to argument 1 (2,3) 2. Response to argument 2 (2,3) Extend #3 (explanation of #3) 1 1. Response to argument #1; 2,3 2. Response to argument #2; 2,3	Extend Refutation #1 Extend Refutation #2	

The Affirmative (Pro) Flow

B1	A2	B1	
Main Argument #1 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #2 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #3 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #4 -Evidence -Conclusion	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">1. Refutation #1</div> 2. Refutation #2 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3 4. Refutation #4 1. Refutation #1 <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">2. Refutation #2</div> 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3	Extend-#1 (explanation of #1) 1. Response to argument 1 (2,3) 2. Response to argument 2 (2,3) Extend #3 (explanation of #3) 1 1. Response to argument #1; 2,3 2. Response to argument #2; 2,3	

This should be the first speech when the debate addresses both sides' flows. The following speeches will be similar in that they should address arguments on both flows.

Another important issue concerning the summary speeches is making new arguments. Because summary speeches are towards the latter part of the debate and are supposed to be *summary* speeches, it is not appropriate to new arguments either as new reasons supporting/negating the resolution or new refutations of the other team's arguments. Making new arguments in these speeches does not give the other team adequate time to refute them, are usually underdeveloped because of the time constraints, and take time away from debating the issues already in the debate. That said, this is just the way things *should* be. There are no hard and fast rules for the content of the speech, and the judges may not even be aware of the ones that do exist.

Chapter 7

The Grand Crossfire

The Grand Crossfire is the three-minute period when all four of the debaters ask each other questions. Similarly, this crossfire should be conducted by the same guidelines of the past two crossfires. Because all four of the debaters will be involved, this period is more likely to get out of control. In addition to the rules stated in the previous section, there are some additional guidelines to keep in mind.

1. Allow everyone to participate in the Grand Crossfire. Don't let it be dominated by one member on both sides.
2. Take turns between partners to ask questions. If A1 asked the first question, when it is the A side's turn to ask another question, let the other debater (A2) ask a question.
3. Don't gang up on the other team. For civility purposes, only one member from each side should be asking/answering questions at a time.

It is important that the questions asked pertain to the arguments still being argued in the debate. Asking questions about arguments from the first speeches that were not extended would be a waste of time. However, if the other team is shifting their position, it might be appropriate to bring up those arguments to illustrate that point.

Chapter 9 **The Final Speeches**

Also known as the Final Focus, the last two speeches are usually what determine the debate in the minds of most judges. This presents the debaters giving the Final speeches with the choice of going for their strongest argument that was extended in their team's summary speech. The reason for only extending the strongest one is because the final speeches are only two minutes long. There is not enough time to extend all of the arguments adequately and to extend refutations of the other team's arguments that are still in the debate.

The First Final Speech

In the first final speech, the debater giving this speech should extend his/her team's strongest argument. Remember that extending the argument involves explaining the claim, warrant, and evidence supporting the argument. Because the team going second will probably extend two main arguments in the summary speech, it is important to address those in the final speech. Instead of making new arguments against those extended arguments, it is much more efficient to extend the refutations made earlier and expanding on those. In addition to extending the refutations of those arguments, it is important that the debater giving the first final speech **weighs** his/her team's strongest arguments against the other team's two arguments. This means that the debater giving the final speech should explain why, if they win their main argument, they should win the round, even if there is some risk the other side is winning their arguments. Essentially, this just means that the debater should explain why his/her argument provides more of a reason to affirm/negate the resolution than the other team's argument(s).

The Second Final Speech

The second final speech is similar to the first in that only one main argument should be extended, as well as the refutations made against the other team's argument(s). This speech will be easier to give than the first final speech because the last speaker only has to address the one argument extended in the first final speech. As in the speech prior to the second final speech, the second final speaker should weigh his/her strongest argument against the other team's remaining argument(s).

Final Speech To-Do List

1. Extend one main argument.
2. Answer the refutations extended against that main argument
3. Extend the refutations made against the other team's remaining argument(s)
4. Weigh your main argument against theirs.

The Negative (Con) Flow: Final Speech

A1	B2	A1	B1	A2
Main Argument #1 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #2 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #3 -Evidence -Conclusion Main Argument #4 -Evidence -Conclusion	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">1. Refutation #1</div> 2. Refutation #2 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3 4. Refutation #4 <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">1. Refutation #1</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">2. Refutation #2</div> 1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3	Extend-#1 (explanation of #1) 1. Response to argument 1 2. Response to argument 2 Extend #3 (explanation of #3) 1. Response to argument #1 2. Response to argument #2	Extend Refutation #1 Extend Refutation #2	Extend #3 1. Explain 2. Extend Responses 3. Weigh against Other team's argument

The Affirmative (Pro) Flow: Final Speech

B1	A2	B1	A2	
Main Argument #1 -Evidence -Conclusion	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">1. Refutation #1</div> 2. Refutation #2	Extend-#1 (explanation of #1) 1. Response to argument 1 2. Response to argument 2	Extend Refutation #1	
Main Argument #2 -Evidence -Conclusion	1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3 4. Refutation #4			
Main Argument #3 -Evidence -Conclusion	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">1. Refutation #1</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">2. Refutation #2</div>	Extend #3 (explanation of #3) 1 1. Response to argument #1 2. Response to argument #2	Extend Refutation #2	
Main Argument #4 -Evidence -Conclusion	1. Refutation #1 2. Refutation #2 3. Refutation #3			

Chapter 10 **Preparation Time**

This section is dedicated to suggestions concerning when and how to effectively use preparation time. Preparation time should never be used before either team's first speech. These speeches should be prepared prior to the debate or tournament. Likewise, preparation should not be used before a crossfire period. The debaters should use their preparation time to think of arguments to respond to the other team's arguments, not to think of questions.

The first time when a team might need to use preparation time is before either of the second set of four-minute speeches. This would be a good point to use preparation time to ensure that the following speech answers all of the other team's main arguments and to mentally think about how much time the debater wishes to spend on each argument. However, if blocks are written prior to the debate, then it would minimize the amount of preparation time needed before these speeches because all the arguments would be written out in response to the other team's main arguments.

As a general rule, debaters should refrain from specifying to the judge how much time they wish to use before taking **prep time**. For example, do not say to the judge, "I will take 25 seconds of prep time." Instead, simply inform the judge that you will be taking prep time. The reason for this is because you might need to use more than the time you specified to the judge; it would avoid creating an expectation for the judge when you will be done using preparation time. In addition to this, debaters should never set a certain amount of time before starting to prepare their speech; if the debater needs more time then it is important the debater uses as much time as he/she needs. However, it is

also important, as well as polite, to make sure the debater is taking into consideration the amount of time left for his/her partner.

If the debaters have the appropriate blocks developed before the debates, then there would not be need to take prep time prior to the second set of four-minute speeches, unless there was one or two arguments the debaters did not have a block to. If this is this case, preparation time should be used to write down arguments refuting the other team's main arguments.

Preparation time should be used before the summary speeches because these are very important speeches in the debate. The prep time used should be spent doing the following:

1. Looking for main arguments dropped by the other side
2. Deciding which arguments are the strongest; deciding which ones to extend.
3. Writing responses to the other team's refutations of the main arguments.
4. Time allocation: writing down the amount of time the debater wishes to spend on each argument.

Lastly, prep time should be used before the final speeches spent on similar things, such as:

1. Look for a dropped argument, if any.
2. Decide on the one main argument to go for, the dropped ones usually tend to be the best choice because the other team agreed to it.
3. Write extensions to your refutations against the other team's extended arguments.
4. Write arguments that weigh your argument(s) against the other team's.
5. Time allocation: write the amount of time to spend on each argument.

Do not 'steal' prep. 'Stealing' prep is when a debater prepares when preparation time is not being taken. This includes telling the judge the debater is done with prep and then continuing to discuss with his/her partner arguments that need to be made. However, it is okay to discuss and prepare arguments while the other team is taking prep time.

Chapter 11 **Judge Adaptation**

When participating in a Public Forum debate, debaters are likely to encounter many different types of judges. Judges tend to range from college students, members of the community, parents, bus drivers, high school teachers, to former debaters. Because each individual judge differs on preferences, it might be difficult to debate one particular way that would be persuasive to everyone. **Judge adaptation** is the changing of one's debate style to best suit the judge. If a debater knew what would be the most persuasive to every single judge he/she had, the rate of success would increase dramatically because it is your judge who decides who wins, not your flow or anyone else's flow. However, judge adaptation is a difficult skill to acquire and, if mal-adaptation occurs, it potentially could be detrimental. The following will provide some general rules for all judges, as well as some tips for specific types of judges.

General Rules for All Judges

1. Be polite when debating and participating in crossfire. Most people do not enjoy seeing high school teenagers being rude to each other.
2. Be as clear as possible when making or refuting an argument.
3. Reference which of the other team's arguments you are refuting.
4. End the speech as soon as possible when the speech time is over.
5. Speak as professionally as possible. Do not use slang or derogatory words.
6. Develop arguments as much as possible. Most judges will not be persuaded by unsubstantiated claims.
7. Be prepared to defend definitions of terms in the resolutions. Definitions can sometimes make the difference between winning and losing a debate.

'Lay' Judges

Lay judges are people who judge the debate that have no prior experience in argumentation or debate, and/or have seen no (or very few) debates. They are typically not familiar with debate jargon or the rules of the debate; they generally are not sure what

to expect of the debate if it is their first time. These judges would include members of the community, bus drivers, and parents of school children. These judges typically do not ‘flow’ the debate.

The most effective style of debate/speaking when there is a lay judge in the room is to speak slowly and articulately. Debaters might even need to explain their arguments more. However, the debaters should be careful not to be condescending when explaining the arguments. Another persuasive strategy is to relate the **impact** of the arguments to the judge. For example, if the judge is the mother of students in high school and the topic is standardized testing, the debaters might want to explain their arguments in terms of how the students/kids will be affected, either positively or negatively. On the other hand, the debaters should not make it obvious that they are catering to the judge’s personal life to avoid seeming patronizing to the judge.

It might be appropriate for the debaters to ask the judge questions before the debate begins. If the debater senses that they might have a lay judge, they might want to ask, “Have you ever seen a debate before?” If the answer is ‘no,’ then the debaters know that they have a lay judge. In order to find out additional information about the judge, the debaters might want to ask, “How did you get involved in judging debate?” The response may be that the judge’s child was in debate or that he/she was a bus driver who was asked to fill in for a judge. This would help the debaters determine if they needed to adapt to the judge.

‘Former Debater’ Judges

Former debaters are often asked to judge at debate tournaments by tournament directors. These judges will know a bit more about the activity than lay judges; however,

how much more they do know will vary from judge to judge. Information can be discovered by asking similar questions of these judges. If the answer to the question, “Have you seen a debate before?” is “Yes, I used to debate in high school,” a follow question could be, “What type of debate did you do?” or “How many years did you debate in high school?” to get a better sense of the judge.

These judges will know more about debate and are more likely to flow the debate round. They may ‘pick-up’ on arguments faster than lay judges, and might need less explanation of those arguments. Debaters should refrain from explaining the typical rules and procedures of Public Forum debate to these judges because, if they have debated before, they might feel offended that the debaters do not think that their judge knows what is going on. This would also take up needed time in a speech to explain the arguments being made. Additionally, most former debaters that are judging will have a pretty good idea of what is supposed to happen anyway.

Speech Times

A1 -	4 minutes
B1 -	4 minutes
Crossfire-	3 minutes
A2 -	4 minutes
B2 -	4 minutes
Crossfire-	3 minutes
Summary A1-	2 minutes
Summary B1-	2 minutes
Grand Crossfire	3 minutes
Final A2-	2 minute
Final B2-	2 minute

Glossary of Terms

Abuse- when team engages in a practice that is unfair to the other team

Affirmative- the pro side

Blocks- a list of pre-written arguments that refute predictable arguments that the other team may make

Card- a segment of a newspaper, journal, or magazine article, a book, or a scholarly website that supports the arguments made by the debater

Case- the pro's or con's main arguments presented in the first speech

Claim- the first part of an argument that makes a statement of fact

Con- the side negating the resolution

Controversy- an alternate name for public forum debate

Cross-Apply- to reiterate an argument made previously in the same speech

Crossfire- (1) period of time when two debaters ask each other questions; (2) an alternate name for public forum debate

Defense- refutations of the other team's reasons for the judge (arguments) to affirm or negate the resolution

Dropped (To Drop)- when an argument is not refuted by the other side

Evidence- published facts or statistics used to prove a point

Extend- to reiterate an argument made in a previous speech

Final Speeches- the last set of speeches when the debaters should extend their team's strongest argument(s); each one minute long

Flow- notes of the debate

Flowing- taking notes during the debate round of the main arguments made by both sides.

Grand Crossfire- the last crossfire in which all debaters participate in asking and answering questions

Impact- the negative consequences of either affirming or negating the resolution; a pro or con of the resolution

Judge Adaptation- the ability of a debater to determine the type of judge he/she has and modify his/her style of debate to appeal most effectively to a specific judge

Lay judge- a judge who has not seen, or has seen very few, debates

Negative- the con side

Offense- arguments that give reasons for the judge to affirm or negate the reason

Prep Time- preparation time; each team gets 2 minutes

Pro- the side supporting the resolution

Qualification- the accomplishments of an author that make him/her qualified to make arguments in a specific field

Resolution- the topic for the debate specifically worded that the debaters argue for (pro) or against (con)

Source- the author or place evidence comes from

Summary- second to last set of speeches that summarize a few of the team's main arguments; each are two minutes long

Time allocation- spending a specific amount of time on one argument or another

Warrant- the second part of an argument that gives a reason to support the claim

Weigh- to make an argument as to why one argument comes before, proceeds, or should be evaluated above another argument