

CSU, Fullerton Public Forum – October 8, 2011

Cal. State Fullerton is pleased to host a public forum tournament on October 8, 2011.

The pedagogical goals are these:

- Provide a tournament-based debate experience for competitors with little or no training in competitive intercollegiate debate
- Provide a format that is evidence-oriented while training students to appeal to intelligent but non-specialized arbiters
- Teach students how to develop arguments, focus on key points of clash, and put together complex ideas as they speak to specific propositions; we seek the highest-quality argument with the least amount of jargon or stylized debate structure
- Provide for high-quality, local competition that does not require extensive travel budgets
- Debate issues of contemporary relevance that resonate with students

Here are the rules:

- Judges should hold college degrees but should not have extensive policy debate training or experience. Graduate students without debate training are ideal candidates; other faculty members are welcome. Judges should render their decisions based on the quality of the logic and evidence presented; speaker points are awarded for presentation.
- Evidence may be read in the debate but only from the sources provided below. It is our hope that in the future we will offer novice divisions who use only the prescribed sources and advanced divisions where students can use any source they post on-line; at this initial tournament all competitors are limited to the sources provided below.
- Otherwise, debaters are free to apply logic and common knowledge to topic. No stock issues or burdens specific to the event are assumed; debaters are free to develop their own topoi for argument evaluation, keeping in mind the ultimate goal is to persuade a non-specialized critic who will not know what a counterplan, kritik, or disadvantage is. Substantive focus is encouraged.
- Teams are composed of 2 debaters each; 2 rounds of judging per entered team.

Time limits:

1AC: 6 minutes

2NC CX of 1AC: 2 minutes

1NC: 6 minutes

1AC CX of 1NC: 2 minutes

2AC: 6 minutes

1NC CX of 2AC: 2 minutes

2NC 6 minutes

2AC CX of 2NC: 2 minutes

1AR 4 minutes

1NR 4 minutes

2AR 4 minutes

2NR 4 minutes

5 minutes of preparation time per team. Total talk and prep time is 58 minutes per debate.

SCHEDULE

8am Registration in **College Park**

9 am Round 1

10:30 am Round 2

12:00 pm Lunch

2 pm Round 3

3:30 pm Round 4

Awards ASAP

OVERVIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY:

Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas on September 15, 2011 formally declared his intention to seek full membership for a Palestinian state in the United Nations, rejecting pleas from U.S. and European governments and brushing aside warnings of possible retaliation by Israel. The United States has said it will veto a Palestinian membership resolution in the Security Council. This resolution asks the question: Would peace come to Israel in Palestine if the global powers embraced a two-state solution?

TOPIC: The US should support full membership for a Palestinian state in the United Nations.

(Debaters May Use Any Evidence from the Affirmative or Negative Articles)

Affirmative Articles

Margaret Besheer (September 14, 2011), Voice of America, “UN Assembly to Focus on Arab Spring, Palestinian Statehood”, <http://www.voanews.com/english/news/middle-east/UN-Assembly-to-Focus-on-Arab-Spring-Palestinian-Statehood-129845903.html>

Balakrishnan Rajagopal (September 16, 2011), Huffington Post, “The Palestine UN Vote: Is There a Duty to Admit?”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/balakrishnan-rajagopal/the-palestine-un-vote-is-b_964918.html

YOSSI ALPHER (September 11, 2011), “An Israeli Case for a Palestinian State”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/12/opinion/12iht-edalpher12.html>

JOEL BRINKLEY (September 16, 2011), The Kansas City Star, “Obama should pause on veto to Palestinian state”, <http://www.kansascity.com/2011/09/16/3147438/obama-should-pause-on-veto-to.html>

Negative Articles

New York Times (September 11, 2011), “Palestinian Statehood”, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/12/opinion/palestinian-statehood.html?_r=1&scp=3&sq=Palestinian%20statehood&st=cse

Bloomberg (September 14, 2011), “All Parties Lose in Vote on Palestinian State Resolution: View”, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-09-15/all-parties-will-lose-in-un-vote-on-palestinian-statehood-resolution-view.html>

Michael Elterman (September 14, 2011), Vancouver Sun, "Palestinian bid for UN-sanctioned state recognition a prescription for endless Mideast conflict"
<http://www.vancouversun.com/news/Palestinian+sanctioned+state+recognition+prescription+endless+Mideast+conflict/5402057/story.html#ixzz1YBcOzn5H>

Robert M. Danin, (September 15, 2011), CNN, "UN vote: A detour off the path to Palestinian statehood",
<http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2011/09/15/un-vote-a-detour-off-the-path-to-palestinian-statehood/>