Lesson 10: NSDA Finals 2018 Round Analysis

Topic: Resolved: On balance, the benefits of United States participation in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) outweigh the consequences.

Terms in resolution:

NAFTA: Nafta was a trade agreement signed between the United States, Canada, and Mexico in 1994. The deal liberalized trade by eliminating tariffs and quotas between the countries.

Speeches

Neg Case:
- Sole contention with 2 links into their impact. The case paints a good narrative.
- The speaker spoke at a reasonable pace with good clarity. Clarity is the primary goal of delivery because it ensures that the judge can understand everything that is being said.

Aff Case:
- Aff provides a framework (what the team believes the judge should evaluate the round on).
- They argue that the round should be evaluated on 2 things: first, the benefits of continuing US support in NAFTA, second, the benefits NAFTA has already had.

First Cross:
- The speakers ask each other specific questions. Questions should be used to further an argument or to set one up if possible.

First Rebuttal:
- The second speaker signposts (lets the judge know what he is refuting). He goes down their case, responding in the order the arguments were presented.
- Example of **non unique**: on bailouts - The US would've bailed out Mexico either way because Clinton didn't want illegal immigrants spilling across the border. That's why they didn't bailout Chile even though the US had an agreement with Chile,

meaning the bailout would have happened with or without NAFTA.

Second Rebuttal:
- Aff collapsed on bailouts, which was their last link on C2. It is strategic to make your collapse the last argument in case because debaters tend to undercover and run out of time to respond to arguments presented later.
- Example of a **turn**: food prices decreasing. Realize that there is weighing on the turn (scope and magnitude). This is good because weighing provides more offense and makes it more difficult for the opponents to respond.

Second cross:
- Neg's question about how the US would have prevented the economic crisis without NAFTA is a good example of using responses as a cross question.

First summary:
- Neg provides an offtime roundmap, which is useful for helping the judge know where to flow.
- They go for destroying domestic industries (but they don't have that many options because they only have a sole contention with 2 links).

Second summary:
- Extends bailouts (which they went for in rebuttal).
- Example of weighing: outweighs on scope because recession goes global.

Grand Cross:
- All four speakers are engaged.
- Sometimes the second speakers prep during this time and the first speakers take over, but in this round everyone spoke.

First FF:
- Summarizes the main arguments in the round and the arguments that the judge should be voting on. For them it is gradual liberalization and regulation.
- Good rhetoric towards the end with repetitions of the phrase "on balance." Rhetoric is important especially in lay rounds.

Second FF:

- Points out a piece of evidence that is the reason the other team should lose. It's good to emphasize specific cards if they are important in the round. In this example, it is the evidence saying that Mexico could have opted for more regulations and protections under NAFTA but didn't, so it was the fault of the Mexican government rather than NAFTA.

Note: in 2018, summary speeches were only 2 mins but now they are 3 mins.