

Urban Debate League ft. MC H. Kissinger: International Relations



with a general focus on getting novices up to speed and reviewing fundamentals for everyone else

(with a total lack of focus on concise subtitles)

(Kissinger is only a little bit of a war criminal)

*****GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING*****

- Tentative date for the first tournament of the year is **Friday, October 9th**. Get your kids excited (and paired up and ready to go!!!)
 - Explain to any new people who are scared that coming to the tournament and just observing rounds is an option.

Week 1: Re-convening and getting to the concept of a case

Today the goal is to get the kids through the basics of debate, argumentation, and cases. This means that it will be very, very boring for any debaters that are even slightly experienced. To mitigate this, **as you move into the instructional part of the class, make “learning groups”-- each totally new person should be grouped with an expert(s), and middling to below average debaters should be distributed evenly.** If people have questions, try and let the expert debaters in each group field them/explain concepts. This should keep them at least a little engaged.

1. Opening meeting/discussion (15 minutes)

- a. For any new people, describe what UDL looks like--weekly practices, tournaments (both ours and UPenn, Osterweis, Yale HST, etc.), and free summer camp!
- b. Fun introductions
 - i. Have everyone get in a circle and say their name, grade, why they like debate, and what they did this summer. The second person in the circle is also responsible for stating what the first person said. The third for the first and second. And so on. The last person is responsible for the entire circle.

2. Intro to debate (**15 minutes**)
 - a. Lead a fairly directed discussion of what debate is.
 - i. i.e. get them to point of “a conversation between you and the judge and the other team about who is doing the best thing.”
 - b. Explain the broad structure of a debate round:
 - i. **A motion**
 1. A thing that the government believes or wants to happen (THBT/THW)
 2. Examples of motions
 - a. THBT sanctions are never justified
 - b. THW lead a military action against the Islamic State
 - c. THW invade North Korea
 - d. THBT the U.S. ought to join the International Court of Justice.
 - ii. Two sides, the **government** and the **opposition**
 1. the people who believe the motion and the ones who don’t
 2. go through very quickly what the Gov’t and Opposition would respectively be advocating for--what would their position be.
 - c. But how does the judge decide between the two sides? Arguments!
 3. Arguments and cases (**30 minutes**)
 - a. Explain what an argument is--
 - i. An
 1. **independent**,
 2. **complete**
 - ii. reason to believe something.
 - b. Components of an argument:
 - i. Claim--what you are saying is true about the world.
 - ii. Warrant--why what you are saying is true actually is true; evidence.
 - iii. Impact--why people should care that what you are saying is true.
 - c. Examples of arguments, on **THW invade North Korea**.
 - i. Claim: Invading North Korea would end serious human rights abuses.
 1. Warrant 1: North Korea is an authoritarian police state with concentration camps, hero-worship of the Kim family, and an atrocious record of human rights violations.
 2. Warrant 2: North Korea’s military is weaker than ours, so we could easily do it.
 - a. Impact: By invading North Korea and displacing the current regime, we could materially and drastically improve the lives of millions. This is worth doing.
 - ii. Claim: Invading North Korea would harm US foreign policy goals.

1. Warrant: China and North Korea have a strong relationship.
2. Warrant: China has a great deal of sway in that region of the world.
3. Warrant: China probably wouldn't like us invading one of their allies.
 - a. Impact: We will be much less capable of getting anything done in Asia than we were before.
- iii. Have the class generate new arguments (probably call on students when they raise their hands so it isn't a ton of people calling out at once).
- d. The concept of a case:
 - i. 2 to 4 arguments grouped together. The government and opposition each have their own case.
 - e. If time permits, begin a flow on the board and show how it works in broad strokes.

Week 2: All the way to the MO (introducing flowing, light refutation)

1. Review (10 minutes)
 - a. What did we do last time? Have the kids provide as much of this as possible so they are actively learning, and get them to repeat Claim-Warrant-Impact at least once.
2. Intro to the flow discussion/lecture (5 minutes)
 - a. Explain what a flow is--basically, their roadmap for the round. Draw one on the board.
3. Walk-through round part one: creating two cases (15 minutes)
 - a. Using **THBT the U.S. should act as the world's police:**
 - b. Have the class come up with 3 arguments on each side. When an argument has been given, cold call people to improve the argument in some way. Better claim/warrants/link chains, etc.
 - c. After finishing up the constructive portion of the LO, explain that the LO has to do something in addition to making a case: refute.
4. Walk-through round part two: refutations and rebuilding (**rest of time**)

As you are doing this, mention the speakers--PM, LO, MG, MO--and how they fit into the round.

- a. Lecture/discussion on refutation
 - i. Explain that refutation is tearing down the other side's arguments.
 - ii. Three BASIC ways to do this:
 1. Attack the claim.
 - a. "This won't happen/isn't true."
 2. Attack the warrant.
 - a. "The evidence and logic they gave is inadequate."
 3. Attack the impact.
 - a. "This doesn't follow from the warrants/isn't all that bad."

- iii. As a class, refute the two cases.
- b. Rebuilding
 - i. Explain the concept of rebuilding--essentially refuting the refutation.
 - ii. A good refutation should have some sort of C-W-I structure, probably, so they can be attacked in much the same way as arguments can.
 - iii. As a class, finish up the rest of the round through to the MO.
 - iv.

Week 3: Rebuttals

- I. Discussion about purpose of a rebuttal/how to organize (20 minutes)
 - A. Purpose (10 minutes)
 - 1. Crystallization/Summary of the round so far.
 - 2. Explaining to the judge exactly how/why you won.
 - 3. Weighing different arguments
 - B. Organization (10 minutes)
 - 1. Asking 2-3 main questions that summarize the round.
 - a) questions should be offensive→ explaining why you won.
 - 2. Talking about 2-3 most important issues in the round (you should be winning these issues).
 - 3. Depicting both the Opp world and the Neg world. Compare/contrast in such a way to show that you're winning.
- II. Walk through a Round (30 minutes) (also have students flow on this on their own)
 - A. Motion: THW lead a military action against the Islamic State
 - B. Have students come up with arguments for and against the resolution
 - C. Choose the 3-4 best arguments for both sides and write them down on the board
 - 1. develop each argument a little bit (claim, warrant, impact)
 - D. Then come up with the responses for each argument. Write this out on the board next to each argument.
 - E. Using all of this information, have 2 students come up with a rebuttal for each side (get more experienced students).
 - F. After the more experienced students give a rebuttal, ask other students give another version of a rebuttal.
- III. Discussion: Terrorism/Non State Actors (Rest of the Time)
 - A. Using the ISIS motion as a springboard to talk about other terrorist organizations/non-state actors.
 - B. Potential Topics to Discuss:
 - 1. What is terrorism?
 - 2. Causes?
 - 3. How to stop terrorism?
 - a) combat
 - b) change hearts/minds using social/economic influences.

4. Does terrorism pose an imminent danger to the US?

Week 4: Refutation/IR Content

I. Refutation: (30-40 minutes)

- A. Explain what refutation is: (5 minutes)
 1. Responding to your opponent's' points
 2. Usually happens the most in the LOC (2nd part of the LO), where the LO responds to the PM's case in the "on-case" portion of the speech, and in the MG, where the MG responds to the LO's off-case in the "off-case" portion of the speech.
 3. But also happens in the MO and even in the rebuttals, as long as there are no *new* responses being brought into the rebuttals!
 4. Football analogy: debate has offense and defense. You need offense to win -- if you don't score any points, you can't win a game. But you also need defense to stop your opponent from winning. *Usually*, the offense comes out in your own points and the defense comes out in refutation. But sometimes, you can also bring offense out in refutation.
- B. Write out claim warrant impact on board, show how refutation can attack point or links. claim is false, attack claim. arg against link. (5-10 minutes)
- C. The 11 Types of Refutation -- go through these with examples . (10 minutes)
 1. "Blocking" refutation = the most defensive kind. It's where you simply show that your opponent's argument is wrong or flawed in some way.
 - a) The Claim is False
 - b) The Warrant is False
 - c) The Warrant Is Missing
 - d) The Impact is Missing
 - e) The Claim and Warrant Don't Support the Impact ("The Impact Doesn't Follow")
 2. "Turning" refutation = turn your refutation into offense
 - a) The Opposite of the Claim is True
 - b) The Opposite of the Warrant is True
 - c) The Opposite of the Impact is True
 - d) The Impact is Bad
 3. "Weighing" refutation = a mix of offense and defense. It's basically a way of saying their impact is less important than your arguments and your impacts
 - a) My Argument Gets Their Impact Better
 - b) My Argument Gets a Different Impact, but It's More Important
- D. Refutation Activity: (10-15 minutes)
 1. Give students a motion

- a) 1 student gives an argument for the motion
 - b) 2nd student refutes argument
 - c) keep playing this until each student has participated in either giving an argument or refuting an argument.
2. Motions:
- a) THW support a two state solution in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (give some general background if necessary).
 - b) TH, as the US government, would sponsor democracy in other countries.
 - c) THW get rid of Veto power in the UN.

II. Content (15-20 minutes)

A. Have discussions on various topics in IR that you find interesting/kids find interesting.

- 1. either use topics suggested below
- 2. ask students beforehand what they want to know about

B. United Nations

- 1. How effective is it?
- 2. Should it have more/less power?
- 3. When should it intervene in conflicts?
 - a) human rights?
 - b) existential danger?

C. Cold War

- 1. What does the world look like when there are two superpowers with directly competing visions?

D. Middle East

- 1. Israeli-Palestinian Conflict
- 2. Syria
- 3. Iran
- 4. ISIS
- 5. Afghanistan

E. China

F. Europe

- 1. EU
 - a) Euro
 - b) lending/borrowing money
- 2. Greece
 - a) debt
 - b) bail out
 - c) austerity
 - d) should it leave the EU?

G. Africa

1. Arab Spring
 - a) did it work?
 - b) more or less democracy?

H. Latin America

1. Cuba--good that we normalized relations?

Week 5 (if necessary): Practice Round

Have a practice round, with the most experienced debaters in the round and everyone else flowing:

THW prohibit placing economic sanctions on a developing country.