

Greenhill

SCHOOL

Dear Colleagues,

The Greenhill Debate team cordially invites you to attend the 30th annual Greenhill Fall Classic Debate Tournament, September **17-19, 2016**. We will try to offer you and your students not only outstanding academic competition but also a pleasant tournament experience. Rest assured the 30th edition of the Greenhill Fall Classic will be a special one. Please notice the tournament schedule: Lincoln-Douglas Debate rounds will be held on Saturday and Sunday; policy rounds will be held Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. Greenhill is proud to be designated as a University of Kentucky Tournament of Champions qualifying tournament for both policy debate teams and Lincoln-Douglas debaters reaching the octo-finals as well as a maximum point earner for the National Debate Coaches Association Championships.

Please read the invitation carefully in that it contains new and important information that will affect all those attending the tournament. A common theme of this invitation, based on the language and implicit assumptions therein, is that you are a guest of Greenhill School and its coaching staff and, by attending the tournament, you are agreeing to adhere to our guidelines as a condition of participation in the Greenhill Fall Classic. While we certainly hope that you join us, if you have pedagogical beliefs that differ from our requests, we respectfully ask that you exercise your right to attend other competitive opportunities for your students. We believe that attending an invitational tournament such as the Fall Classic is a privilege, and not a right.

In past years, over 100 schools, 116 policy debate teams and 104 Lincoln-Douglas debaters from 25 states competed in the Fall Classic. We expect an outstanding and competitive field this year as well. Entries must be received by Friday, September 2. **However, we recommend you enter at the earliest possible date. We have been full long before the deadline in the past several years, so please enter early to ensure entry. All entries must be submitted on the Joy of Tournaments website. Please do not email or call in entries - they will not be accepted.**

We are happy to announce that we will return to the Dallas/Addison Marriott Quorum, 14901, Dallas Parkway, Dallas, Texas 75254. The hotel is a quick 5 minute drive from the Greenhill campus. This newly renovated property offers amenities that will benefit all those attending the tournament including substantially reduced rates; free internet access; a free continental breakfast for debaters, coaches and judges on Monday morning; and updated rooms for all. The hotel is located within 2 miles of 120 restaurants. **We respectfully request that all tournament guests stay at the Dallas/Addison Marriott Quorum. All participants and coaches who attending the policy or Lincoln Douglas Round Robins are required, as a condition of accepting the invitation, to stay at the host hotel.**

We are continuing our school/hotel fee this year of \$100. Please read before stressing - the fee will be waived if you stay at our tournament hotel OR you are a local school. When you are entering students online, please email Aaron Timmons at timmons@greenhill.org to waive that fee. Either list that you are local OR the name the reservations are under at the Marriot. If there are other circumstances that cause you to not stay at our tournament property, please drop Aaron an email for discussion. We don't want to make a dime off this fee. In fact we are not allowed by Greenhill to make ANY money on the tournament. Our goal is solely to provide a service to the community. We just are requiring our participants to fill our hotel contracts so we can continue to utilize our contracts for tournament competition space and to house our hired judges and tournament officials. We offer meals for competitors and coaches; we have negotiated a good price for the hotel (including free internet and a shuttle for those that wish to utilize that service), in addition to the hospitality one has come to expect at the Greenhill Fall Classic. That said, we cannot lose money in hosting the event.

Please notify us directly and not just on Tabroom if you have an attendee who needs limited room movement.

Bathroom Access – We will publish a list of gender neutral restrooms on campus.

Registration will take place on Friday evening at the Marriott between 7:30 and 10:30 p.m.

The finals of the Greenhill Policy and Lincoln - Douglas Round Robins will begin at approximately 7:30 pm on Friday night, September 20, at the Marriott. We invite your squad to come and see the final round!

We hope you can attend this year's Fall Classic!!

Sincerely,

Aaron Timmons

Eric Forslund

Director of Debate

Associate Director of Debate

Greenhill School

Greenhill School

timmons@greenhill.org

forslunde@greenhill.org

Lodging

We *strongly* encourage you to stay at the Dallas/Addison Marriott Quorum. Phone - 972.661.2800. The tournament rate is \$88.00 for a king or double room. The hotel will be providing free internet for all attendees in guest rooms **and** public spaces. In addition, the hotel can provide shuttles for those in need of a ride to the school. While the hotel is only a 5 minute drive from the school, we understand that in tight times, schools may need to cut costs and the hotel is working with us to do just that and maximize savings for you. The hotel is also providing a continental breakfast on Monday morning. Please make your hotel reservations as soon as possible. To book reservations directly please paste the following URL into your browser.

[Book your group rate for Greenhill School Debate Tournament 2016](#)

When calling for reservations, please indicate that you are with the Greenhill Debate Tournament. **You must make reservations by August 31, 2016. When making reservations please send a rooming list to the hotel to facilitate check in.** Elimination rounds in policy debate on Monday will be held at the Dallas/Addison Marriott Quorum. Phone: (972 661.2800). If you have trouble with reservations for some reason, please contact Aaron Timmons at timmons@greenhill.org immediately to have the problem resolved. If the web registration indicates that single rooms don't exist, please call the hotel to confirm the double rooms. We have more than enough doubles to accommodate everyone's needs.

Food

Greenhill parents will provide complimentary breakfast and lunch on Saturday and Sunday for all contestants. We will also provide breakfast and lunch for the coaches or sponsors. We hope everyone will stay on campus and enjoy this complimentary service. We will accelerate rounds if possible. If you opt to leave campus and we accelerate the schedule, we will NOT rerun debates that are missed.

Chaperones:

Students competing in tournaments should be accompanied by an adult who is an employee of the school or school district the student(s) represent. An acceptable alternative is an adult who has been background checked by the school, and has approved of that adult taking full responsibility for the care of students of that school while at the tournament. Schools will be asked to list who that adult will be as a condition of final registration.

Event Rules

Policy Debate: This is a varsity division for your most experienced team(s). The format will be 8-3-5 with ten minutes of preparation time. Six preliminary rounds with two presets and four power-matched rounds will be held. All power-matched rounds will be high/low within the brackets. This division will break to double octo-finals. **We will not break brackets.**

The resolution to be debated is - **Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic and/or diplomatic engagement with the People's Republic of China.**

EACH SCHOOL WILL BE ALLOWED TWO POLICY TEAMS. We will entertain requests for 3rd teams as space permits. You will be notified by email no later than August 23 about the status of your request. DO NOT assume confirmation of your 3rd team; wait for notification before making travel arrangements.

Lincoln Douglas Debate: This is a varsity division for your most experienced Lincoln-Douglas debaters. Lincoln-Douglas debaters will be allowed five minutes of preparation time. Six preliminary rounds with two presets and four power-matched rounds will be held. All power-matched rounds will be high/low within the brackets. This division will break to double octo-finals. The resolution will be the September/October National Forensic League resolution. **Resolved: Countries ought to prohibit the production of nuclear power.**

Each school will be allowed two entries. We will entertain requests for a 3rd Lincoln Douglas debater as space permits. **We will not break brackets.**

In requesting extra entries two important considerations should be noted. First, no director should request extra entries unless they feel those students have an above average chance of advancing to elimination rounds given the difficulty of the competition at the Fall Classic. Second, schools requesting extra entries must provide judging for those entries. No school will be allowed to "buy out" of all of its judging.

World Schools Division: The WSDC format is comprised of 3-person teams that compete in any given round. A school may have five total members, all of which may participate in the impromptu preparation time. Teams are allowed to switch speakers to make different combinations for three person teams in any given round. During each round, each team will compete against another 3-person team from a different school. If the team is from the United States, they must represent the school for which they are currently enrolled, have principal/head of school/divisions approval to travel and compete as part of the school's official debate team, and have an adult chaperone present at the tournament. If the team is international or represents Team USA, then all competitors for a team must be enrolled in high school (or an equivalent institution in their country of origin) and must have an adult chaperone/coach (at least 18 years of age and graduated from high/secondary school). This division may be limited in size so enter soon. We will start out with a cap of 20 teams but may adjust that depending on interest.

There will be a diversity of prepared and impromptu motions. These motions will be released at least three weeks before the tournament so that participants have ample time to prepare for the competition.

Also, instructional videos that you might find helpful in preparation can be found at <http://debate.uvm.edu/wsdcvideo.html>.

All teams in the World Schools division must have a judge that is familiar with the WSDC format and will be willing to commit to the training that will be provided by the tournament. NO team will be allowed to "buy out" judges in the World Schools division.

Policy and Lincoln Douglas Divisions:

We will be again using a 30 point scale that allows tenth points for speaker points.

We encourage disclosure of decisions and discussion of all debates within the constraints of keeping the tournament on schedule.

All debates must have one winner and one loser.

Awards will be presented to all policy debate teams and Lincoln-Douglas debaters reaching the elimination rounds. Speaker awards will be presented to the top 15 cross-examination debaters and top 15 LD debaters.

*****When we reach capacity entries will be closed. DO NOT make plane reservations until you have confirmation of entries. The information listed on the web entry must be that of the official coach for the school. E-mail information must be supplied for confirmation purposes. Student initiated entries will not be accepted. Signing up on the website alone does not guarantee entry. You will get a confirmation from Aaron Timmons or Eric Forslund via joyoftournaments to confirm acceptance. We also reserve the right not to accept an entry based on a school's delinquent payment of fees or past behavior (students or coaches) that we feel is inconsistent with the goals, and/or continuation of, our tournament.**

Each year more and more requests are coming our way for independent entries. We are unable to accept "independent" entries. **We define an independent entry as a team or student who wishes to compete without the approval, knowledge or consent of their school administration and/or coach (es). All students must compete under the school's name in which they are officially enrolled.**

All judges must be approved, in advance, by tournament officials as a condition of entry. We reserve the right to deny a schools' entry based on a school filling a judge slot with a judge we feel doesn't meet the pedagogical ends of the tournament and based on a system of mutual preference judging will be able to be used in at least half of the debates. A very simple rule of thumb is to ask the question, "would you want the judge you are bringing judging you against a quality opponent if the situation was reversed?"

Registration

Registration will take place on Friday from 7:30-10:30 pm at the Marriott. If you will miss registration due to travel delays, all fees must have been received to ensure your students will be on the pairings round one. Please call the Greenhill Debate Suite at the Marriott at your earliest convenience Friday night to let us know of your status if last minute delays risk you missing registration. **We do not have a "late" registration on Saturday morning. We request that schools adjust travel plans accordingly to arrive in time for registration. Those that arrive late or neglect to register Friday night will be charged a \$25.00 nuisance fee.**

Fee payment is required before students can compete. NO EXCEPTIONS. We apologize for the harsh tone but in the past, we have had a few coaches abuse our hospitality and neglect to pay us in a timely manner. As a result, you must have a school check, personal check, or cash in order for you students to compete in round one. **The refrain of "the school will send the check" at registration, without proof, is not enough.** If you have no form of payment, you must present a personal check for the amount of the entry in order for your students to compete. **WE WILL NOT HOLD PERSONAL CHECKS UNTIL WE GET A SCHOOL CHECK.** We will give you a receipt so that your school can reimburse you. Additionally, schools with drops and/or no shows of entries or judges will need to clear those debts before students are allowed to compete. We apologize for our

inflexibility with this rule, but our hands are tied given late payments by several schools over the past few years and the role we have had to play as “collection agents” to close our books for the year.

We understand that in tight budgetary times individual team members may be responsible for paying their own fees. In the case of multiple team members competing, we ask that team members coordinate before registration and that one check is submitted for payment and that the school’s name is in the subject line of the check.

All schools are responsible for payment of fees based on the number of entries listed as of September 7. Drops between September 7-18, will result in forfeiture of entry fee (and the potential of judge fees if we have contracted with someone to fill a spot that you have requested). Drops on September 20 will incur loss of entry fee, potential judge fee, as well as a \$25.00 drop fee.

We respectfully request that each school only present one check for payment to aid in our bookkeeping. Any personal checks must include the school’s name in the memo line as well please.

Debate Fees:

Policy Team	\$130.00
World Schools Team*	\$130.00
Lincoln Douglas Debater	\$85.00
Policy Debate Judge	\$50/per round
Lincoln Douglas Debate Judge	\$30/per round

*All World School teams must have a judge in order to compete.

Make checks payable to:

Greenhill School
Attn. Aaron Timmons
4141 Spring Valley Road
Addison, TX 75001

Case List (Applicable to both Policy Debate and Lincoln Douglas Debate)

As mentioned in the opening letter, those attending the Greenhill Fall Classic are guests of Greenhill School and its coaching staff. While we value different pedagogical perspectives, at this event, we are unwavering in our perspective on the value of openness. Openness promotes comprehension and preparation, which are critical components for effective clash and better debates. As the host of an early season tournament, we feel particularly compelled to promote an environment that facilitates better debates for the students involved. As competitors for the rest of the season, we appreciate that competitive drives can run into conflict with openness. Finding the appropriate balance between the learning environment and the competitive environment deserves continued consideration. We have decided that a willingness to take part in a collective case list – in both spirit and in practice – is an essential characteristic to accepting the invitation to our event. Case lists enhance the pedagogical and competitive goals of openness by allowing students to better understand their opponents' arguments which is an essential component to quality clash and better debates.

If you cannot agree with the stipulation below, we respectfully ask that you explore other competitive opportunities on this weekend. Those that DO attend, yet attempt to evade/ignore our requests, will be asked to leave. Participation in the Greenhill Fall Classic, and its benefits like mutual preference judging, is a privilege, not a right.

It is also our belief that teams/debaters have an affirmative obligation to update the wiki as new arguments are run throughout the tournament. To clarify, this is a requirement/expectation to compete.

For the last few years we experimented with a case list in Lincoln Douglas debate and after much reflection and improvement on the implementation of the details of submission, we will once again **require** all competitors to submit information to a case list available to all coaches and students in both policy and Lincoln Douglas Debate.

It is the duty of coaches to inform students of the expectation of disclosure/the case list.

Links to a Drop box are not acceptable. All information must be placed directly into the wiki.

You may ask – “Why are you doing this”?

1. We are of the belief that a culture of openness in the sharing of academic information and believe that a case list is one vehicle to maximize that objective.
2. A case list that is *required* of all participants helps to “democratize” the collection of information for all schools in attendance. Without an official case list, schools with plenty of resources, coaches etc and are in the “inner circle” acquire a disproportionate amount of information relative to others.
3. A case list that is *required* of all participants, and clarifies the expectations for submission, helps to avoid “freeloading” by those that access the information, yet don't contribute the same level (or any amount) of information.

You may ask – “What are you requiring us to do”?

1. The community norm that has developed (and seems to be working) in policy debate is that no one should have to disclose a position that they haven't run yet. We feel this norm is applicable to Lincoln-Douglas as well. We are not asking you to disclose information BEFORE you run it. Specifically, if this is your first event of the year you do not have to disclose your positions until you run them. For example, if you run a case round one, only then does it become public information.
2. The expectation is that all debaters are required to disclose positions (affirmative and negative) and full citations (including page numbers of the evidence), and a few words from the beginning and end of the card, that are read in any debate on the National Debate Coaches Association wiki. The URL for the case list is

<http://www.debatecoaches.org/resources/wikis/>

An example of the format follows.

3. We ask that each team/debater submit information to the wiki in a timely manner. **The community norm in policy is to put things online within a round or so of it being run. If you run a new position in elimination rounds, you should post it immediately after the decision.** Greenhill School has an open wireless connection and for those with laptops, submission directly to the wiki should be easy. For those without laptops we will allow you to use the computers in a designated computer lab to submit the information. After the last round of the evening, we ask that once you arrive at your hotel, or place of residence, that you submit arguments broken before retiring for the evening.
4. **If your advocacy is such that you read a case that doesn't have a traditional structure, please include enough of a description to allow a delineated thesis of the position. A good rule of thumb is this: include any and all information that you would want your own debater to have to better understand and prepare to debate the case in question.**
5. **If major arguments are not dependant on evidence, those arguments should be summarized on the wiki along with complete citations.**
6. **Cases disclosed should specify both school and team/debater. A debater saying, "See X persons wiki we run the same cases", doesn't meet the spirit, or letter of our expectations.**

You may ask - "I don't like disclosure/case lists but want to come anyway because the tournament is really good. What are you going to do if I don't participate/attempt to fly under the radar"?

The point has been made that by accepting the invitation to attend the Greenhill Fall Classic, you understand that you are guests, and agree to participate fully with the guidelines outlined in the invitation. As such, attempts to circumvent the intent of the case list will be dealt with in a direct manner given the clarity in which the expectations have been made this year. The tournament directors reserve the right to either remove mutual preference judging or ask competitors to leave if the feeling is that there was an effort to subvert our request. Aaron Timmons and Eric Forslund will make the final judgment of potential violations. "Lawyering" regarding what was expected will not be engaged or tolerated. Two examples illustrate unacceptable behavior we have observed over the years:

- A) Attempts to overload your wiki with information in order to conceal your arguments will result in disqualification.
- B) Coaches were overheard asking students to report incomplete and perhaps more egregiously, telling students to LIE about their position. These behaviors are unquestionably unethical from our perspective and will result in disqualification.

Our point in attempting to clarify expectations is to avoid ANY conversations regarding potential disregard, or violation of our requests at the tournament. Again, with all due respect, no one has a right to either attend, or continue competition, in the Greenhill Fall Classic if requests are ignored. If you have questions prior to arriving in Dallas regarding our requests, please email Aaron Timmons at timmons@greenhill.org.

You may ask - "What if our genuine attempts to comply are considered insufficient? Will we be punished?"

Teachers evaluate sincere versus insincere efforts from students every day so we are very comfortable making these judgment calls. We are not interested in a role as the Disclosure Police. However, enforcement is an essential part of any successful endeavor. We want compliance which best benefits all of our guests rather than using any punitive actions. If there is a concern, prompt and courteous compliance will go a long way. We are comfortable in being able to tell the difference. Here is a good rule of thumb for those sincerely interested in positive compliance with this community expectation: include any and all information that you would want your own student to have if they were in this debate.

With all due respect to divergent positions on these issues, we are committed to a culture of openness and a sharing of information at the Fall Classic. Please understand that belief as you make a decision to attend our event.

To provide clarification about the expectation of the timeliness of disclosure, we ask that the information be placed online after you have debated on both sides of the resolution. At worst, all information should be online, with sufficient detail and correct formatting by the end of round four.

Example of a Lincoln-Douglas case from the wiki past seasons:

Value is Morality

A consistent moral philosophy should explain the structure of moral reasoning and the kinds of obligations that follow from this structure. Thomas Nagel, "Equality," *Mortal Questions*, Cambridge (Cambridge University Press, 1979), 126. "I have a...with fair detachment"

This view yields a moral obligation to minimize the unacceptability of policy options. Thomas Nagel, "Equality," *Mortal Questions*, Cambridge (Cambridge University Press, 1979), 126 "So let me...in this sense"

Standard is minimizing the unacceptability of policy options

A. Economic sanctions harm the most disadvantaged members of society.

Roger Normand & Christopher Wilcke (Wilcke completed his degree of Master of Philosophy at the University of Oxford in Modern Middle Eastern Studies in the summer of 2001. Roger Normand is co-founder and Executive Director of the Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR), a human rights group that advocates against poverty and economic injustice both at home and abroad.) *Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems* Fall, 2001 SYMPOSIUM: INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ: WHERE ARE WE AFTER TEN YEARS? *Human Rights, Sanctions, and Terrorist Threats: The United Nations Sanctions Against Iraq* "The third concern...the most valuable"

This harm is built into the logic of economic sanctions. Roger Normand & Christopher Wilcke (Wilcke completed his degree of Master of Philosophy at the University of Oxford in Modern Middle Eastern Studies in the summer of 2001. Roger Normand is co-founder and Executive Director of the Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR), a human rights group that advocates against poverty and economic injustice both at home and abroad.) *Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems* Fall, 2001 SYMPOSIUM: INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ: WHERE ARE WE AFTER TEN YEARS? *Human Rights, Sanctions, and Terrorist Threats: The United Nations Sanctions Against Iraq* "**This conclusion elicits...further** impoverish them"

The indiscriminate nature of sanctions is instrumental to their success; this factor is what makes sanctions a uniquely immoral foreign policy tool. Mark R. Amstutz [Professor of Political Science at Wheaton College], "The Ethics of Economic Sanctions," *International Ethics: Concepts, Theories, and Cases in Global Politics*, Third Edition, 2008, 189 "Some scholars have...on the leadership"

B. Economic sanctions increase harms against non-consenting individuals beyond the imposition of sanctions themselves; they increase the power of oppressive leaders, furthering human rights abuses.

Jacob Weisberg "Thanks for the Sanctions: Why do we keep using a policy that helps dictators?" *The Slate*. Aug. 2, 2006. <http://www.slate.com/id/2147058/> "Sanctions tend to...off their chains"

Also, sanctions increase the probability of war. David J. Lektzian and Christopher M. Sprecher [University of New Orleans and Texas A&M University], "Sanctions, Signals, and Militarized Conflict" *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (Apr. 2007) p. 415. "Sanctions can function...will also occur"

Sanctions exacerbate intra-state conflicts by creating an imbalance of military capability. Noel Malcolm [Fellow of the British Academy, History], *Bosnia: A Short History*, 1994, 241-242. "Because the war...sentence of death"

Not even targeted sanctions can avoid the problem of targeting a nation in the face of intra-state conflicts. Jacob Weisberg "Thanks for the Sanctions: Why do we keep using a policy that helps dictators?" *The Slate*. Aug. 2, 2006. <http://www.slate.com/id/2147058/> "Tyrants seem to...for 47 years"

C. Diplomatic sanctions have proved to be an effective alternative to economic sanctions.

James A. Phillips (Senior Policy Analyst at the Heritage Foundation). "The Changing Face of Middle Eastern Terrorism." October 6, 1994. <http://www.heritage.org/Research/HomelandSecurity/BG1005.cfm> "Countries victimized by...1991 Gulf War"

Economic sanctions are immoral because they harm the worst-off more than alternative foreign policy options. A.J. Christopher [Professor of Geography, University of Port Elizabeth], "The Pattern of Diplomatic Sanctions against South Africa 1948-1994," *GeoJournal* 34.4 (1994), 439-446, at 446. "The application of...the international community"

Example of a Policy disclosure from the wiki in past seasons:

Plan text: The United States federal government should provide just compensation to property owners in the Klamath Basin who lost their water irrigation rights.

Advantage One – ESA Credibility:

In 2001, the government used the Endangered Species Act to curtail farmers irrigation rights in the Klamath Basin in order to protect two endangered species – this over-reach of the ESA has created mass amounts of controversy and will jettison ESA credibility

Fein, Reviewing Doremus and Tarlock, 9 (Ian, JD Candidate @ Berkeley Law, "Book Review: Salmon, Science, and Subsidies: A Book Review by Ian Fein* of Water War in the Klamath Basin: Macho Law, Combat Biology, and Dirty Politics by Holly Doremus and A. Dan Tarlock (Island Press 2008).", 36 *Ecology L.Q.* 775, @Lexis//greenhill-ak) Tension between competing ...may prove instructive. n141

The backlash is due to the regulatory focus of the ESA – compensation is vital to balance competing interests

Stern 6 (Stephanie, Prof of Law @ Loyola, "ARTICLE: Encouraging Conservation on Private Lands: A Behavioral Analysis of Financial Incentives", 48 *Ariz. L. Rev.* 541, @Lexis//greenhill-ak) The traditional model of command ... to particular conservation issues.

B) Property Rights

Compensation is vital to patent protection – lack of property rights creates a market disincentive

Taub 6 (Bradley, JD Candidate @ John Marshall Law, "ARTICLE: Why Bother Calling Patents Property? The Government's Path To License Any Patent And Maybe Pay For It", 6 *J. Marshall Rev. Intell. Prop. L.* 151, @Lexis//greenhill-ak) To remedy Kelo's virtual elimination ... behind their backs. n242

A strong patent system is key to the economy – it is the only way to restore the manufacturing industry Maghame 9 (CQ Congressional Testimony, 3/10, "Patent Law Overhaul"; Senate Judiciary Committee; Taraneh Maghame, Vice President Of Patent Policy And Government Relations Counsel At Tessera, Inc., A Company That Leads In Semiconductor Packaging) The Innovation Ecosystem The US ... by large firms.

Economic collapse guarantees nuclear war Mead 9 (Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Walter Russell, "Only Makes You Stronger," *The New Republic*, 2/4/09, <http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2>)

Also, other countries model lax US patent protection – this undermines international enforcement Jacobs 6 (Irwin, Chairperson of the Board of Directors for Qualcomm, “Promoting Competition and Protecting Incentives for Innovation,” Progress on Point, Release 13.22, September, http://www.pff.org/issues-pubs/pops/pop13.22_jacobs_speech.pdf) We in the United States ... greatly diminished.

Patent protection is key to restoring US-Sino trade relations Reuters 8 (Sourced from the Reuters InterActive Carbon Markets Community, REWP provides scientific information and discussion necessary for engineers, energy professionals and policy makers, "U.S. says lax china ipr hampers clean tech trade", <http://renewenergy.wordpress.com/2008/01/10/us-says-lax-china-ipr-hampers-clean-tech-trade>) China's lax ... for the health of the planet.”

This prevents war over Taiwan Eland 5 (Ivan Eland, Cato Institute, “Avoid Threatening China Over Its Currency,” May 31, 2005, www.cato.org)

That conflict will escalate and cause nuclear war Johnson, Journalist, 5-14-1 (Chalmers, “Time to Bring the Troops Home,” The Nation, Volume 272, Number 19)

Also – US–Sino cooperation prevents extinction - it solves every impact Wenzhong, PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2-7-4 (Zhou, “Vigorously Pushing Forward the Constructive and Cooperative Relationship Between China and the United States,” <http://china-japan21.org/eng/zxxx/t64286.htm>)

Judging

The most important factor in determining a quality tournament is the quality of the judging. Please assist us in having the best pool of judges possible by making judges available to us that reflect the quality of the competition. Towards that end we ask that all parties which are part of a school's staff in either an official or unofficial capacity (which are eligible/qualified judges) be available for *at least* one preliminary round to make the pool as large as possible to reflect the diversity of perspectives that is "national circuit debate." The determination of "eligible/qualified" is left up to the tournament staff. We will not use community judges at the Greenhill Fall Classic. **All schools providing judges must ensure they are of sufficient quality to judge a minimum of four debates in a world of mutual preference judging. First year judges are allowed to fulfill a school's commitment, but we respectfully request that the head policy or LD coach serve as a critic and be represented on the strike sheet and we ask that ALL judges be available for double octo-finals to make the best panels possible.** In addition, please remember that you are obligated one round past the time your team/debater is eliminated. Please help us in this communal effort by planning travel accordingly. Those who opt not to adhere to our reasonable request may be asked not to return and their name and school affiliation will be passed on to the Directors of other major invitational tournaments. We will offer schools the ability to rank/strike a limited number of judges online. **ALL SCHOOL JUDGES MUST BE SUBMITTED BY SATURDAY NIGHT, SEPTEMBER 10, 2016 AT MIDNIGHT.** Our goal is to have rankings/rating sheets online by Tuesday morning to allow schools to review these lists and enter their choices online. **Schools must complete rankings/ratings by Friday, September 16 at 2 pm Central Time.** Any school that opts to/neglects to fill out the information online (and by the deadline) will forfeit the privilege to do so. Debate coaches are strongly encouraged to embrace the responsibility of filling this information out themselves and not turning it over solely to students. With all due respect to those attending the Greenhill Fall Classic, the luxury of rankings/ratings are a privilege and not a right. If the tab room feels adjustments to the judge pool/assignments are in the best interest of tournament to do so, we will exercise that option. So that no confusion about this statement exists, one example where the tab room might exercise its jurisdiction to change a panel's make up is if all first year judges make up an elimination round panel. Rest assured we will attempt to honor preferences.

New - If a school's judge(s) depart before fulfilling their school's commitment, a fine of \$100.00 will be assessed. Those not paying within 30 days will have their school's name passed on to the Director of other major invitationals.

New - **OPT-IN** – If you are a judge who is non-cisgender male and/or black and would like to opt-in to the elim judge placement system to ensure proportional representation, please email Aaron Timmons at timmonsa@greenhill.org. We are hoping to incentive folks to opt-in to our diversity placement program by offering \$35 for every elimination round judged beyond a person's commitment.

Clipping/Ethics Challenges – The tournament will defer to the judges in determining ethics/clipping challenges. It is not our intention to review.

Judging Requirements:

One policy team, World Schools team, OR LD debater = one judge for 4 prelim rounds plus required elim rounds.

Two policy teams OR LD debaters = one judge for 6 prelim rounds plus required elim rounds OR two judges for 4 prelim rounds each plus required elims.

Three policy teams OR LD debaters = two judges required for 6 prelim rounds EACH plus required elim rounds.

We will hire additional judges for you at the rate of \$200 per uncovered team or \$175.00 per Lincoln - Douglas debater. Schools bringing both policy, World School teams AND LD debaters are obligated for judges in each division. All schools must provide the first judge in each division entered.

1:30 pm	Complimentary Lunch in Dining Hall- students
2:30 pm	Awards Assembly - TBA
3:15 pm	Doubles Policy, Octos Lincoln Douglas (single flight)
3:15 pm	Semi Finals World Schools (prepared motion)
4:45 pm	Quarterfinals - Lincoln Douglas
4:45 pm	Finals - World Schools (prepared motion)
6:15 pm	Octos - Policy, Semis - Lincoln Douglas (single flight)
7:45 pm	Finals - Lincoln Douglas

Monday (Marriott Quorum - September 19, 2016)

7:30 am	Continental Breakfast
8:30 am	Quarters - Policy
11:15 am	Semis - Policy
2:00 pm	Finals - Policy

Greenhill School will provide breakfast and lunch for tournament participants

Coaches and Judges Lounge - West Dining Hall