

• **TRANSCRIPT: SECOND NEGATIVE SPEECH: ALEX**

The affirmative holds that the International Criminal Court is the only way to solve the problem of trafficking. It is wrong, and I am going to show you why. First, I am going to answer its arguments and then offer new arguments based on evidence.

22

Affirmative's first argument is that the problem must be tackled on an international level and that the U.S. is the only country making progress against trafficking on a national level. This supports our contention. No other countries are making progress, and this is the reason for our alternative. We want to give nations assistance to improve their legal and judicial systems and solve their own problems. Worldwide enforcement of laws based on the U.S. model could end trafficking. Support for this comes from Kelly E. Hyland of Washington College of Law, who wrote, "The Act's three-part framework could serve as a model for nations that have the desire and ability to implement a comprehensive approach." Thus, we can attack this problem without the International Criminal Court.

23

Moving on to the argument that the Court will be diverse and that each nation will have a voice, I would like to extend my partner's arguments on this point. We have shown how the International Criminal Court will be discriminatory and political. The ICC will be abusive in many ways. It will use its power for political gain. Law is not math or physics; it is subjective. Judges will make decisions based on their own views and prejudices. Consequently there will be no diversity, and nations will have no voice. The International Criminal Court is not a round table, where everyone has an equal voice. Some will not be heard. Let's use the example Jon gave in his speech. In this case the vote to prosecute was almost evenly divided. Is it fair to ignore the will of almost half the nations and initiate prosecution? In addition, Peguy dropped my partner's second argument that the structure of the court would promote corruption and mismanagement. The ICC is the first international organization of its kind, and he gave us no evidence showing that it will work.

24

Now, let's move on to sovereignty. Peguy says that nations are not really sovereign under the status quo; we are living in a modern world where nations rely on each other. This is not true. Modern nations guard their sovereignty and do not really depend on one another. Because there is no control over the court, the ICC will violate sovereignty. Nations will not tolerate laws or decisions they oppose. This can lead to controversy and, perhaps, to war.

25

Negative has a better way of dealing with human trafficking. Our solution will not threaten sovereignty because we will deal with trafficking at the national level. Affirmative argues that our approach will be biased because different countries will deal with the problem differently. Our program is not biased because it takes into consideration individual cultural factors. The ICC will be biased, and its use will lead to war. Negative should win. I now stand ready for cross-examination.

• **TRANSCRIPT: SECOND AFFIRMATIVE CROSS-EXAMINATION:
ASA (AFFIRMATIVE) AND ALEX (NEGATIVE)**

26

Asa: Hi, Alex, I really enjoyed your speech. I just have a couple of questions to ask you. First, you say that nations are adopting U.S. measures and that the problem is being solved. How exactly does trafficking in women affect the international area?

Alex: How does it affect it?

Asa: Yes, exactly how does the U.S. based solution effect the international arena?

Alex: I gave you two examples of evidence that are connected. My first says that the United States is taking steps to address the problem. And then I gave evidence that worldwide modeling of U.S.