# Verbatim/Card Cutting Lecture 9/7

## Intro/Organization

USE THE NAVIGATION PANE.

# Pocket

## Hat

### Block

#### Tag

Cite

Underline

Emphasis

Highlight

### Example of Organization

# Midterms Disad -Pocket

## 1NC Shell -Hat

### Warming -Block

#### Republicans could win 60 votes in the Senate, but their success is contingent on Trump's popularity– a filibuster-proof GOP majority would greenlight Trump's agenda -Tag

Barabak 17 -Cite [Mark Barabak, "Here's why the 2018 Senate election will be crucial for President Trump and his Democratic foes," LA Times, 2/17/2017] AZ

In the partisan battle zone that is Washington, there is one conquest that could turn the fight decisively in Republicans’ favor: winning 60 seats in the U.S. Senate. With control of the House, a filibuster-proof Senate majority could empower President Trump and his congressional allies to push through legislation and approve high-level appointees, such as Supreme Court nominees, with Democrats in the minority powerless to stop them. That is why the 2018 midterm election is shaping up as crucial for Trump and congressional Republicans, as well as Democrats fighting to protect President Obama’s legacy and hold the line on further GOP advances. After Democrats netted two seats in the Senate last year, Republicans hold a 52-48 majority, meaning the GOP would need a gain of eight seats to reach a filibuster-proof margin. (That assumes party lawmakers stick together and vote as a bloc, which is never a certainty, as demonstrated by the withdrawal Wednesday of Trump’s nominee to head the Labor Department, Andrew Puzder, in the face of Republican opposition.) So what are the odds? If the 2016 election proved anything, it is the foolhardiness of making political predictions, especially this far out. That said, Republicans start in a strong position — though an eight-seat gain still seems like a considerable reach. The Democrats regaining control of the Senate, which they lost in 2014, is almost impossible to fathom. When is the midterm election? Nov. 6, 2018. How many Senate seats will be contested? Thirty-four, or just more than a third of the Senate. Why are Republicans strongly positioned starting out? Because Democrats will have to defend 25 seats to just nine for the GOP. Gee willikers! Why are those numbers so lopsided? Senate terms last six years; the seats that are coming up in 2018 are ones that were last on the ballot in 2012, when Obama was seeking reelection and Democrats, riding his coattails, gained two seats. That simply means more Democratic-held seats will be contested in 2018. The reverse took place in 2016. After making significant gains in the tea party election of 2010, Republicans had to defend 24 Senate seats compared to Democrats’ 10. Any other reason Republicans are strongly positioned heading into 2018? Indeed. Ten of the 25 seats that Democrats are defending are in states that Trump carried — in some instances by huge margins. He won West Virginia, where Joe Manchin is seeking reelection, by 42 percentage points, and North Dakota, where Heidi Heitkamp is seeking a second term, by 36 percentage points. He also carried Montana, Indiana and Missouri — where Democratic incumbents are facing reelection — by double-digits. What do historical trends suggest? Many of those didn’t hold up so well in 2016, when Trump pulled off one of the biggest political upsets of modern times. So it may be best not to go there. Ah, c’mon! OK, fine. Historically, the party holding the White House loses congressional seats in the first set of midterm elections after a president takes office. That offers Democrats hope. But the pattern is repeated more often in House races than Senate elections. According to the nonpartisan Cook Political Report, the party in power lost House seats in nine of the last 10 elections held at the midpoint of a president’s first term, but gave up Senate seats in only six of those 10 elections. (In a rarity, the GOP actually gained House and Senate seats in 2002, even as Republican George W. Bush sat in the White House, owing to a surge of support following the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.) Would an eight-seat pickup be a lot? A little? Gaining eight seats would be on the upper end of achievement, based on election results going back the last 60 years. Republicans picked up nine Senate seats in 2014, but that was in Obama’s second midterm election, a time of particular political weakness. It would be pretty remarkable for the GOP to post that sort of gain with a member of their own party sitting in the White House. Why is that? Because supporters of the “out” party, that is the one not in control of the White House, tend to be more motivated to turn out than supporters of the “in” party. Part of that may be because, by nature, people are more likely to act — in this case vote — out of anger or dissatisfaction than contentment. Typically in non-presidential elections, there is a significant falloff in turnout among voters who lean Democratic, in particular minorities and young people. That was certainly the case when Obama was in office. Right you are. So what’s the question? Aren’t many of those same groups now highly animated and involved in protests directed at Trump? Very much so. The big question is whether they’ll still be be animated enough to vote in large numbers in November 2018. If so, that would make the Republican reach for 60 seats even tougher. Say, didn’t President Obama once have a 60-seat Democratic majority? Why wasn’t he able to get more done? Democrats did hit the magic 60-seat mark early in Obama’s first term. (Or, to be precise, Democrats held 58 seats and were joined by two independents who voted with the party.) But a delay in seating Minnesota's Al Franken — due to an election recount — the absence of an ailing Robert Byrd of West Virginia and the death of Massachusetts’ Edward M. Kennedy meant Democrats enjoyed that 60-seat high mark for only a relatively brief time. They lost their filibuster-proof majority in February 2010 upon the swearing-in of Republican Scott Brown, who won a special election to finish Kennedy’s term.

## Cutting Cards

#### Example:

#### History proves – the Supreme Court is a preferable actor

Frymer 3 – Paul, Assistant Professor of Sociology and the Law and Society Program, University of California, San Diego, (“Acting When Elected Officials Won’t: Federal Courts and Civil Rights Enforcement in U.S. Labor Unions, 1935–85” American Political Science Review Vol. 97, No. 3 August 2003, <http://www.unr.edu/justicestudies/Links1/JS710/JS710Frymer14/APSR%2097.pdf)> //ET

The Supreme Court was less active in the realm of union discrimination, never passing a case of Brown’s stature or legal scope but supportive of civil rights nonetheless. Often this was done with direct recognition that legislators had failed to act on the matter and with the assertion that it was the Court’s duty to rectify the situation. In Steele v. Louisville & Nashville R. Co., 323 U.S. 192 (1944), the Supreme Court’s most notable statement on union civil rights during these years, the majority held that unions have a statutory duty of “fair representation,” by which they cannot discriminate on the basis of race when representing employee interests. In response to a railroad union that supported a collective bargaining agreement which eliminated most African American jobs, the Court rewrote the Railway Labor Act: “We think that Congress, in enacting the Railway Labor Act ... did not intend to confer plenary power upon the union to sacrifice, for the benefit of its members, rights of the minority of the craft, without imposing on it any duty to protect the minority” (199, 200). This assertion was reiterated on numerous occasions both by the Supreme Court (see Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen v. Howard, 343 U.S. 768 [1952]; Ford Motor Co. v. Huffman, 345 U.S. 330 [1953]; Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41 [1957]) and by lower courts that overturned the efforts of white union members to deny rights to black employees. Even when the EEOC participated in the lawsuits, it was often unclear whose agenda was being followed. Civil rights lawyers quickly seized on the overwhelmed agency that received nearly 9,000 complaints in its first year. Lawyers were not simply helping the agency become more efficient, they were attempting to speed through procedural hurdles so that they could pursue their own agenda in federal courts. Judith Stein (1998, 102) writes that the NAACP’s legal director Jack Greenberg told the EEOC “that his lawyers could do [their] investigatory work. Greenberg was less concerned with improving agency fact-finding and conciliation than with getting cases to court. He required only a pro forma run through the process ... then he could sue.” At the same time, these lawyers were pursuing an agenda with Congress that often opposed legislative efforts to strengthen EEOC power. While almost yearly efforts to reform the EEOC by giving it cease and desist powers both failed and were opposed by key legal organizations, lawyers were consistently able to get Congress to strengthen the courts’ role in promoting civil rights reforms. For example, the 1964 Act provided attorneys’ fees to victorious litigants, making it easier for poorer clients to sue and making it more worthwhile for lawyers to take Title VII cases. The 1972 reforms provided the EEOC with the power to represent discriminated employees in court but did not provide the cease and desist powers advocated by civil rights groups and labor unions, the latter who were supporting a stronger EEOC in exchange for an end to Title VII’s private right to sue (Hill 1977, 34–38; Meany Archives 1971b).18 Not only were cease and desist powers opposed by the Nixon administration as well as southern and conservative members of Congress (Graham 1990, 433–43)—they preferred court enforcement of civil rights claims, in part because they felt that southern federal courts would provide stricter definitions of the law than the EEOC (Bureau of National Affairs 1973, 354–68)—but also they were opposed by civil rights lawyers, who were emphatic about maintaining the private law suit and opposed cease and desist powers as an alternative (Meany Archives 1968).19 Legal organizations and bar associations widely lobbied Congress to protect the private right to sue, as well as to defeat a bill that would have limited class action suits in discrimination cases, and the support of civil rights lawyers made it easier for opponents of the EEOC to legitimate to civil rights supporters.The history of union integration demonstrates the significance of judicial power on a matter of national importance. Judges interpreted statutes in ways that denied unions the benefit of well-crafted loopholes. Judges and lawyers helped devise and then aggressively implemented new courtroom procedures that made it easier for civil rights plaintiffs to access the courtroom and achieve success once they were there. Civil rights lawyers besieged unions with lawsuits and judges compelled compliance with the use of special masters and by ordering unions to pay significant financial fees for back pay, attorneys’ fees, and damage fees. Far from a “hollow hope” (as Rosenberg [1991] labels them), courts acted independently and forcefully I conclude with three broader consequences and implications. First, the institutional power of courts described in this article is both historically situated and, in important ways, constant over time. Courts gained power when elected officials were unable to respond on their own and looked to defer and displace political conflict onto the courts. In this regard, my work agrees with Mark Graber’s (1993, 36) argument that courts are historically most powerful when “the dominant national coalition is unable or unwilling to settle some public dispute.” In addition, courts gained influence at a time when lawyers and judges were greatly expanding their own professional opportunities. Congress aided, but only tacitly, this expansion of the legal community. The specific historic nature of these reforms meant that they could later be taken away. By the mid-1970s, Congress started to pay closer attention to the politics of legal rule making. In 1973, Congress rejected rule changes for the first time and has since remained far more active in this process (Bone 1999). Congress has also scaled back professional opportunities for lawyers, restricting class action and attorney fee opportunities. The Supreme Court has also changed and now reviews legal and procedural matters differently. Many of the Court’s key decisions that put pressure on unions, from Griggs to Weber, have since been either overturned, severely narrowed, or reinforced only by statute. At the same time, as American political development scholars have argued with regard to other institutions, certain historical developments that increase an institution’s power are not so easily displaced even in times when electoral officials favor such changes (e.g., North 1990; Skowronek 1993). Moreover, there are features of U.S. legal systems and courts, such as their reliance on common law and the multitude of judges and forums that are provided to civil rights litigants, which enable courts always to provide a certain degree of malleability and dynamism that can give rise to political activism even in moments of historical retrenchment (McCann 1994).

\*8: Shrinks Text, Easier to Read (aka 8 point font)

Step 1: Underline and Bold Important Stuff

Step 2: Read through only underlined and bolded text and highlight the most important things. Aka warrants only.

Step 3: 8 Point everything else.

### Drill: Cut the card

#### Warming causes extinction. Adams 16

**Adams 16** --- has a degree in agriculture and cites studies done by NASA and the IPCC   
(Andrew, Prince George Citizen, 4/16/16, “There is no debating scientific facts,” http://www.princegeorgecitizen.com/opinion/columnists/there-is-no-debating-scientific-facts-1.2229437)

Last week I wrote about the signs of early spring and put a few jabs at climate change deniers. This column did exactly what I had hoped. It sparked conversation on the topic. Those who commented on the article were in fact climate change deniers, stating random outliers of data in the overall trend, which is akin to the Republican senator of Oklahoma who brought a snowball to the senate floor as evidence that global warming was a hoax. I am so glad this type of outlandish behavior has not manifested itself in Canadian politics as of yet. Weather is what you get and climate is what you expect. This week I hope to explain climate change to those who don't fully understand the science behind it. I write this column with a mere bachelor of science and only a handful of classes in a human and environmental interaction masters program before I left school to tackle other adventures that I felt academia would only prevent me from doing all the while furthering my student debt. So while I am not an expert on this topic I do however have an understanding of the scientific process and natural processes that allow us to understand climate change. Glancing into my personal library one could reasonably make the statement that I may have a better understanding than your average Joe. It's true the climate has always been changing. While observed records of our climate indeed are not extreme in age, pollen in lake sediment, trapped air bubbles and neutrons in glaciers can give us a reasonable degree of accuracy (of the past 800,00 years according to NASA) when looking to the past climate fluctuations. In our last century of climatic observations we have observed an overall increase of approximately .74 degrees Celsius increase in global temperatures according to NASA and the IPCC. While this number does not seem significant, it is when you live in an extreme environment such as the arctic. Think back to your history book's description of the Franklin expedition, now remember last week's stories from CBC on the cruise ships traveling the Northwest Passage with thousands of people aboard the ships. 97 percent of climate scientist agree that this warming (which is happening) is not caused by orbital variation nor sun spots or solar flares. These experts agree this climate change is anthropogenic. While I believe Prince George has no doubt its share of scientific geniuses, I don't believe that there is a scientific genius in P.G. that is more informed on climate change than the leading 97 percent of top climate scientists. It is true that the climate has been warm before and this is not the problem. The problem is the rate at which the change is occurring. According to NASA, "As the Earth moved out of ice ages over the past million years, the global temperature rose a total of four to seven degrees Celsius over about 5,000 years. In the past century alone, the temperature has climbed 0.7 degrees Celsius, roughly ten times faster than the average rate of ice-age-recovery warming." We are now in the sixth great extinction on Earth. In fact geologists are now calling our current Epoch the Anthropocene as our industrial existence has now left its mark geologically on Earth forever. In 1750, there was 250 PPM of carbon dioxide (the most important greenhouse gas) in our atmosphere now there is 400 PPM. If you were to drive a car somehow up through our atmosphere for 100 kilometres you would then be in outer space. This is how small our atmosphere is. It is ludicrous to think that all of our industrial emissions have not been able to change the composition of our thin veil of an atmosphere It saddens me that some still deny these dire facts because we have work to do and no time to waste. There is no one to blame but ourselves. To those who think this is a nefarious plot against the common man from the government and scientists, I think you must first assume our government is intelligent enough to push such a plot as this onto the public and ask yourself, why would they do such a thing, what would be the benefit, and also, "Have I been spending too much time on YouTube watching conspiracy theories?" P.s. The Earth is not flat.

## Citations/Evidence ETHICS! (Adopted from Raam Tambe)

#### A proper citation:

Carpenter 16 — Ted Galen Carpenter, Senior Fellow for Defense and Foreign Policy Studies and former Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, holds a Ph.D. in U.S. Diplomatic History from the University of Texas, 2016 (“America Should Step Back from the Taiwan Time Bomb,” *The National Interest*, July 6th, Available Online at http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/america-should-step-back-the-taiwan-time-bomb-16864?page=show, Accessed 07-11-2016)

#### Citations include: Last Name Year Published. Full Author Name, Credentials (If possible). (“Title of Article,” *Source,* Date, URL, Date Accessed [Not Necessary])

You may be dq’ed if you don’t properly cite evidence.

### **Drill: Write a citation**

URL: https://www.deabteislegit.com

Date: July 4, 2017

Date Accessed: 9/7/2017

Title: Debate is a legit event

Author: Matthew Graca

Credentials: Debate Coach at Gabrielino High School, 45th place NSDA Nats.

Source: The Debate Foundation

**Citation:**

#### Find the date or come close to it: -Check author’s profile, check google’s cached copies, use wayback machine. Go as low as you can.

#### Peer reviewed: Cut peer-reviewed evidence and research.

#### Clippings: You must read the entirety of the card. Or tell the judge. EVERY SINGLE HIGHLIGHTED WORD MUST BE READ OUTLOUD

### Cutting evidence

#### Deciding what to cut: it’s hard. Not every paragraph is useful. Read the entire article. It says a ton of time. READ THE ARTICLE.

#### Cutting the card: Prefer longer evidence than shorter evidence. Longer evidence is more persuasive. Underline and box AFTER you read the whole article. Don’t massacre your evidence. Have warrant fully fleshed out. Have a strategy when researching and know what you’re looking for. IF you have a lot of time and you’re aff, then let the literature guide you.

#### How to quickly put together ev before a debate: Use verbatim.

WHEN YOU CUT CARD, YOU MUST COPY/PASTE THE ENTIRE PARAGRAPH WHERE THE LINE THAT YOU WANT CAME FROM.

## Part 1: Cutting Cards Effectively

### F2/3 Paste and Condense Text & Drill

The Haitian government called for all institutions, public and private, including banks and stores, to be shut down from noon on Thursday until further notice.

President Jovenel Moïse said in a televised speech that his cabinet had spent a week preparing for the hurricane, but he also outlined the challenges ahead, noting that 77 percent of the country was mountainous, much of it inaccessible by road.

He urged people to heed the hurricane warnings and get to a safe place. “The hurricane is not a game,” he said.

All schools in the country were closed on Wednesday and Thursday, and the more than 800 temporary shelters set up across the country have started providing food to people affected by the storm.

The police are working with local officials to evacuate people from the most vulnerable areas along the northern coast, “by force if necessary,” Interior Minister Max Rudolph Saint-Albin said at a news conference on Thursday.

The concern is not just about possible drownings and injuries from the storm, but also that a surge of cholera could follow, as [happened last year](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/world/americas/cholera-haiti-hurricane-matthew.html?mcubz=0%20https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/15/world/americas/cholera-haiti-hurricane-matthew.html?mcubz=0)after Hurricane Matthew devastated the country’s southwest.

The Minister of Public Health, speaking on national television and radio, urged people to add bleach to their drinking and bathing water and to put together first-aid kits at home.

Citation:

Hurricane Irma, a Category 5 storm with winds of up to 175 miles an hour, continued to tear through the Caribbean on Thursday, leaving devastation in its wake and prompting evacuation orders across the region.

The death toll was at least seven on Thursday afternoon, and the authorities warned that the number could rise as communications improved. Prime Minister Édouard Philippe of France said that four people were confirmed dead on the Caribbean island of St Martin, lowering a previous toll of eight deaths given by local rescue officials.

A St. Martin official said on Wednesday night that “95 percent of the island is destroyed.”

More than 70 percent of Puerto Rico households were without power on Thursday, though the territory appeared to be largely unscathed, the governor said. It was the latest blow for a territory mired in bankruptcy and debt that have left public works like power plants and retaining walls in poor shape.

#### Now, condense the text, cut the card and do proper citations for the card you cut above.

URL: https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/07/world/americas/hurricane-irma-caribbean.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=a-lede-package-region&region=top-news&WT.nav=top-news

Date: September 7, 2017

Title: Hurricane Irma, Churning Over Dominican Republic, Heads Toward Turks and Caicos

Author: New York Times Newsroom Staff

Date Accessed: 9/7/2017

Source: New York Times

Credentials: N/A