The VERY basics of Progressive LD Debate

1. Offence – Defense **THIS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT THING!!!**

   a. Offence: a line of argumentation that supports upholding YOUR Side of the resolution. May be made on the framework of EITHER DEBATER!

   b. Defense: A line of argumentation that refutes an argument made by your opponent.

   c. Students win by having unrefuted offensive argumentation on either framework.

   d. <u>You may lose your framework and still win a debate by proving that the resolution should still be upheld/refuted under your opponent's framework.</u>

2. Framework:

   a. Essentially Value and Criterion

   b. Criterion is normally called "Standard"

   c. May not be clearly labeled

   d. Framework may have arguments that seem like the typical UIL intro but are substantive to the debate.

3. Argument Selection

   a. Progressive debate frequently allows students to select strategically, parts of their case to support or abandon.

   b. This is a function of being able to win on an opponent's framework.

   c. IE: If they have offence on your framework you can kick it and win the offence on their framework.

4. Overview/Underview

    a. Overview is an explanation of the relationship between the contentions and the Framework

    b. Underview are preemptive offensive arguments made against anticipated frameworks.

    c. Underview is typically ran at the conclusion of the 1AC

5. LARP (Policy in LD)

    a. Mostly, LARP ACs will advocate a consequentialist VC. There is no reason for this, but it is the trend

    b. Plan Text: description of a policy action, that would be a topical way of doing the resolution.

    c. Advantages

        i. Some harm - why something is bad relative to the framework

        ii. Terminal impact - the biggest/most important consequence

        iii. Uniqueness - in the absence of doing the aff, the harm will exist

    d. Solvency - prove that the aff is going to solve the harm

    e. Inherency - Not necessary in LD, because the resolutions never include the phrase 'substantially increase/decrease'.

6. LARP NEG

    a. Disadvantage - a harm to implementing the plan

    b. Counterplan : A different mechanism for solving the harms the affirmative aspires to solve

7. Kritik

a. Link - Shows that the affirmative leads to some bad impact

b. Impact - Demonstrates what is so bad about the aff's assumption

c. Alternative - Provides a way for us to avoid the Link and Impact

d. Role of the Ballot - justify the standard that the judge should

8. Theory

    a. Interpretation: RULE BEING PROPOSED FOR THE ROUND

    b. Violation: WHAT DID YOUR OPPONENT DO

    c. Standard: METRICS FOR EVALUATING PROPOSED RULES

    d. Voter:

        i. Examples of common voters: Fairness and/or Education

            1. Common justification for fairness: to adjudicate who is the better debater requires that the procedure be fair, otherwise impossible to decide.

            2. Common justification for education: schools fund debate for educational reasons

            3. What should the judge do if you win the interpretation is a good rule AND that the opponent violated the rule?

                a. Drop the argument -- the judge should ignore the opponent's argument that violated the interpretation

                b. Drop the debater -- the judge should vote against the debater who violated this interpretation,

7. Questions?