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Before We Begin...

1. Go to the UIL online store and order the CX Debate Handbook. Digital copies are FREE! This is an excellent resource for debaters and coaches. [http://store.uiltexas.org/](http://store.uiltexas.org/)

2. Be sure that you read through the contest rules before you attend tournaments. Especially pay attention to the rules regarding computers in debate rounds.

3. Know what contests you may combine and which you may not:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF YOU ENTER....</th>
<th>YOU MAY NOT ENTER...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEAM DEBATE</td>
<td>LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE</td>
<td>TEAM DEBATE, ORAL INTERP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSE / POETRY</td>
<td>LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE, THE OTHER INTERP CONTEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATIVE / PERSUASIVE</td>
<td>THE OTHER EXTEMP CONTEST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic CX Debate Structure

**AFFIRMATIVE**

“We should do this!”

-This team **AFFIRMS** the **Resolution** (the topic we are debating)-”Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic and/or diplomatic engagement with the People’s Republic of China.

*BURDEN OF PROOF*

- In order to affirm the Resolution, the **Aff** team will present a **plan** explaining how they propose to do what the Resolution calls for. This is called **THE AFF CASE**.

Vs. **NEGATIVE**

“That would be a bad idea!”

-This team **NEGATES** the **Resolution**.

*BURDEN OF REFUTATION*

- In order to negate the Resolution, the **Neg** team will present reasons why the **Aff** plan will not work and disadvantages to the proposal.
There are 2 kinds of arguments in debate…

**OFFENSIVE**

Offensive arguments are ones that give the judge a reason to VOTE FOR YOU

Ex: I will buy everyone skittles and ponies.

**DEFENSIVE**

Defensive arguments are ones that give the judge a reason NOT to VOTE FOR THE OPPONENT

Ex: My opponent doesn’t brush his teeth.

*this doesn’t necessarily say “vote for me”- it only says “don’t vote for him!”*
Whether OFFENSIVE or DEFENSIVE, an argument must have 3 things:

**CLAIM**
- This is where you state your argument.
- EX: UT is far superior to ATM.

**WARRANT**
- This is the proof supporting your claim.
- EX: “More UT grads go on to be successful than do ATM grads.” -God, 2011

**IMPACT**
- This is where you show the importance or results of your claim.
- EX: UT will eventually put ATM out of business due to its success rates, which means more people will go to UT and be successful contributors to society, pulling America out of economic depression FOREVER.
Now that we’ve established the basics of what makes up an argument…. Let’s begin looking at what makes up the arguments for the Affirmative Case!
THE STOCK ISSUES

These five items make up the basic foundation for any Affirmative case- this is your starting place!

S-significance

H-arms

I-nherency

T-topicality

S-olvency
THE STOCK ISSUES

• All five of the stock issues must be present in every AFFIRMATIVE CASE in order for it to be a proper case for debating.

• If the case has all five of the stock issues, it is considered a **Prima Facie** case, which is Latin for (“on the face” or “at a glance”). This means that all elements are present at first look and that the Affirmative has met part of its burden in the debate round, which is presenting a prima facie case that affirms the Resolution.
SIGNIFICANCE

• The Affirmative must prove that a significant problem is taking place in *the current system*, which is called **THE STATUS QUO**.
• This stock issue is divided into **two types**:
  
  – **QUANTITATIVE SIGNIFICANCE**: this proves that the problem is a big deal using numbers and statistics
    • Examples- Millions are harmed by genocide every year.
    » Global war will damage 90% of natural resources.
  
  – **QUALITATIVE SIGNIFICANCE**: this proves that the problem is a big deal because the impacts are horrible
    • Examples- War allows disease and malnutrition to run rampant.
      • More citizens of war-zones die of famine and disease than the war itself. These human rights violations represent the greatest human evil.
      • Racism, Sexism, Otherization, Paternalism, etc.
HARMS

- Harms are the bad things that are happening in the STATUS QUO
- These range from small scale harms to large harms like global nuclear war and human extinction.
  - Whatever you use in the Affirmative case, you must provide evidence proving that the harms are either quantitatively or qualitatively significant. A single piece of evidence is called a CARD.

Most affirmative teams will set up their harms in scenarios. These scenarios generally include the significance and harms evidence together.

- Examples:
  - Global Nuclear War Scenario
  - Environmental Disaster Scenario
  - Disease Epidemic Scenario

Remember that the Affirmative team must be able to SOLVE or FIX every harms scenario they present in their case. In other words, they have to outline what is wrong and how they propose to fix the problem.
INHERENCY

• Inherency is where you prove WHY the harms are not currently being solved (stopped) in the status quo.

• Inherency is divided into three types, although many affirmatives will use a combination of the three in their cases.

• THE THREE KINDS OF INHERENCY ARE:
  – Structural
  – Attitudinal
  – Existential
STRUCTURAL INHERENCY

- Structural Inherency means that….
  - There is a policy or law currently in place which prevents the status quo from solving for the harms on its own.
  - The affirmative case must repeal, reverse, or work around this law in order to solve for the harms in the status quo.

Example:

Congress has initiated a “pay-go” system of funding new programs in the federal budget. In order to secure money for a project, the funding must be present in the current system. Under this policy, it is nearly impossible to gain additional funds for a project.
ATTITUDINAL INHERENCY

• Attitudinal Inherency means that…
  – There is an attitude or opinion that prevents the harms from being solved.
  – Because the Affirmative team reserves the right to FIAT, this type of inherency is easy to solve within the Affirmative case.

• **FIAT**: the Affirmative team has the right to assert that the plan WILL pass through Congress and the President. This way, the debate will deal more with the aftermath of the plan as opposed to whether or not the plan can be passed. Therefore, the Affirmative team does not have to try to change the opinions in their Inherency because the plan will pass anyway, once the judge votes Affirmative.

Example: Empirically, it has been difficult to pass policy due to congressional gridlock.
EXISTENTIAL INHERENCY

• Existential Inherency means that...

  – The harms are being ignored. There is no particular reason why the harms are not being solved, they just aren’t.

  – This is the weakest type of Inherency. The Negative will argue that the reason nothing is being done is because the harms are outweighed by other more serious harms in the status quo and that action is not warranted.

Example: The federal government has not yet passed education reform.
• Part of the Affirmative burden to present a **PRIMA FACIE** case is proving that the case falls under the scope of the **RESOLUTION**. In other words, the Affirmative case has to be “in bounds” at all times and the Resolution is the “sidelines.” Think of it like a football field.

• *Topicality is not addressed specifically in the Affirmative case. This is primarily a NEGATIVE argument that claims that the Aff. case is **NOT TOPICAL** - that it does not stay “in the bounds” the Resolution provides, thus stealing Negative **GROUND**.*
An easy way to understand T

This would be a topical case...

RESOLUTION

NEG AFF CASE NEG

This is NOT a topical case...

RESOLUTION

NEG AFF CASE NEG
TOPICALITY CHARGES

T-CHARGES are Negative arguments that are made up of 4 PARTS

T-CHARGES MUST CONTAIN ALL FOUR PARTS

A. DEFINITION
B. VIOLATION
C. STANDARDS
D. VOTERS
A. DEFINITION

• The Negative must define one (or more) of the words in the Resolution that they claim the Affirmative case does not meet. This word is where the Negative claims the Affirmative “steps out of bounds.”

• The source of the definition can be grounds for an argument, so be sure to use qualified, legitimate sources to define your words.
B. VIOLATION

• This is where the Negative explains HOW the Affirmative violates the word defined from the Resolution.

• The Negative can only look at the PLAN TEXT to determine whether or not the Affirmative case is topical. The rest of the case is off-limits when determining Topicality.
C. STANDARDS

• The standards are how the judge can decide whether or not the Negative has offered a good definition. “If the definition does this, then it is a good definition.”

• There are many, many standards available for Negative teams to choose from based on the definition they are using….. Most teams present at least 3 standards.
COMMONLY USED STANDARDS

• **Fair Limits**: Definition is better because it fairly limits both teams to an acceptable amount of ground.

• **Bright Line**: Definition is better because it draws a clear distinction between what is topical and what is not, whereas the Aff definition is vague.

• **Framer’s Intent**: Definition is better because it more accurately represents what the framers of the resolution intended.

• **Education**: Definition is better because it allows both sides to gain a greater education about the issues at hand.

• **Ground**: The negative team’s interpretation of the resolution restricts the number of cases that fall within the topic; therefore, the affirmative team cannot run any case they choose. By doing this, you, as the judge, increase the educational value of the debate round.
D. VOTERS

• This is where the Negative tells the judge that the T-Charge is a VOTING ISSUE.

• If the Affirmative has not met its prima facie burden to present a Topical case, then it is not playing by the rules. A judge cannot vote for a Non-Topical case….if the Negative can prove that the case is not topical, then they should automatically win the round.
COMMONLY USED VOTERS

• **Jurisdiction**- Judges cannot vote for non-topical cases because these are outside of their jurisdiction. If we prove non-topicality, then the Aff plan is not eligible for voting.

• **Prima Facie burden**- Topicality is part of the Aff’s prima facie burden. By presenting a non-topical case, the Aff has not met its obligation.

• **Education**- We are here to learn as much as possible about the topic at hand. Non-topical cases decrease the amount of education we can gain and should be rejected.
LET’S TALK ABOUT THE PLAN!

The plan is what the Affirmative team proposes to do to solve the harms. *This is the part we actually look at for Topicality.*

Plans are usually made up of up to three planks or parts:
1. The actual **plan text**: an explanation of what you’re going to do.
2. How you’re going to **fund** the plan.
3. Who is going to **enforce** or carry out the plan.

1. Increase funding and/or regulations of elementary and/or public schools
2. Funding will come from ______ (may not always have this)
3. Enforcement by _______
A. DEFINITION
Definition- INCREASE
to become greater or larger. To multiply; reproduce.

B. VIOLATION
The Aff fills in the blank with analysis about how the Affirmative case violates / doesn’t meet this definition. USE ONLY THE PLAN TEXT.

C. STANDARDS
1. Brightline- The negative’s definition gives a clear distinction between what is and is not considered substantial. Either the 1AC policy measurably increases by 90% or it is not topical.
2. Ground- The negative definition provides a fair division of ground by forcing the aff to run major policies with a substantial increase.
3. Predictability- The negative should be able to reasonably predict potential affirmative ground. The negative’s definition forces the affirmative to advocate major policies for reasons of fairness.

D. VOTERS
1. Rules of the Game- topicality is a procedural argument which must be evaluated first in the round. If the affirmative does not meet its prima facie burden to be topical, then they cannot win the round.
2. Jurisdiction- a judge cannot vote for a non-topical affirmative. Therefore, if we can prove that the aff is not topical, then it is out of the judge’s jurisdiction to vote for it.
• Solvency is **THE MOST IMPORTANT** stock issue.

• This is where the Affirmative proves that the plan they propose will **solve / fix / stop the harms** they claim.

• This stock issue requires the most amount of evidence that is as recent as possible. The evidence must say that the specific Affirmative plan is what will solve the harms- the author(s) of that evidence will be known as the **PLAN ADVOCATE**. The plan advocate is an expert who believes that the Affirmative plan will solve the harms. If this evidence is generic, then the Negative can claim that it does not necessarily include the Affirmative case.

• Most negatives will attack the case’s solvency, so the more evidence you have on hand the better.
OK, Before we go further....

Let’s talk about the order of speeches. Then, we will divide the Negative arguments based on speeches or ....

ON AND OFF CASE ARGUMENTS.
ORDER OF SPEECHES

1st Affirmative Constructive (1AC) - 8 mins
Cross Examination period (CX) - 3 mins
1st Negative Constructive (1NC) - 8 mins
Cross Examination period (CX) - 3 mins
2nd Affirmative Constructive (2AC) - 8 mins
Cross Examination period (CX) - 3 mins

2nd Negative Constructive (2NC) - 8 mins
Cross Examination period (CX) - 3 mins
1st Negative Rebuttal (1NR) - 5 mins

1st Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR) - 5 mins
2nd Negative Rebuttal (2NR) - 5 mins
2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR) - 5 mins

CONSTRUCTIVES- during these speeches, debaters CONSTRUCT new arguments.

NEG BLOCK- these 2 back-to-back Neg speeches offset the Affirmative advantage of having first and last speech.

REBUTTALS- these speeches are for clarifying and strengthening arguments. There are NO NEW ARGUMENTS in these speeches.
SPEAKER DUTIES

1AC- Reads Affirmative case
Cross Examination- 2N questions the 1A
1NC- Reads OFFCASE arguments
Cross Examination- 1A questions the 1N
2AC- Answers OFFCASE arguments / EXTENDS Affirmative case
Cross Examination- 1N questions the 2A

2NC- Reads ONCASE arguments *Emory Shift*
Cross Examination- 2A questions the 2N
1NR- Answers 2AC OFFCASE arguments / extends answers / voters

1AR- Must answer all ONCASE and OFFCASE arguments
2NR- Answers the 1AR / extends answers / impact calculus / weighs round / voters
2AR- Answers the 2NR / extends answers / impact calculus / weighs round / voters

Each team gets 8 minutes of prep time to be used and divided up however they want. It’s good to save as much of your time as possible for rebuttals!

EXTEND means to continue or elaborate on. In the 2AC, it means that the speaker should read EXTRA EVIDENCE to fortify the Aff Case BEFORE it gets attacked by the Negative. It’s like putting up extra defenses in a fortress before the next attack!
This may help with remembering who cross-examines who?!?!?!

Just remember that it’s whoever does not have the next speech.

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE**
- **BATMAN**

**FIRST NEGATIVE**
- **JOKER**

**SECOND AFFIRMATIVE**
- **ROBIN**

**SECOND NEGATIVE**
- **RIDDLER**
One more quick note about CX periods...

These question and answer periods can get ugly very quickly-especially with the female debaters!

So, there is certain etiquette we follow:

1. Look at the judge, never your opponent
2. Stay professional and CALM
3. Only the person who is supposed to be asking questions should be
4. Don’t make arguments in CX, just ask questions
5. Don’t be afraid to ask about anything you don’t understand
6. Use all of your time- it’s free prep time for your partner

GOOD

NOT GOOD
OPEN V. CLOSED CX

UIL rules state very clearly that each debater should question one opponent and should answer the questions of one opponent.

Some debate circuits have relaxed the enforcement of the rules about CXing. What has resulted is called “Open CX”, where all four of the debaters are participating in the same CX period. This is a violation under UIL rules, resulting in a loss for your team. If this happens during a round at a UIL tournament, both teams can receive a loss for the round.
1st AFFIRMATIVE CONST.

The 1AC reads the Affirmative case. This is pre-written.

Cross-Examined by the 2NC.

So far…we’re winning!
1\textsuperscript{ST} NEGATIVE CONST.

- The 1NC deals primarily with \textbf{OFFCASE} arguments. Offcase arguments are ones that don’t deal specifically with the stock issues, with the exception of Topicality because it is a procedural argument.

- **OFFCASE ARGUMENTS** include:
  - Topicality Charges (T Charges, T)
  - Disadvantages (DAs, Disads)
  - Counterplans (CPs)
  - Kritiks (Ks)
DISADVANTAGES

• This type of OFFCASE argument describes what kinds of TERRIBLE, AWFUL, HORRIBLE, “RED-WEDDING-TYPE” THINGS would happen once the plan goes into effect - the disadvantages to using the plan.

• There are 4 BASIC PARTS to every disadvantage. **A Disad must at least have the Uniqueness, Link, Impact.**

DISADVANTAGE SHELL:

• A. UNIQUENESS
• B. LINK
• C. INTERNAL LINK(S)
• D. IMPACTS
A. UNIQUENESS

- Uniqueness explains what is happening in the status quo. It is very similar to Inherency.

- Uniqueness explains why the disadvantage is current and specific (not generic).
B. LINK

• The link explains HOW the Affirmative plan sets off the domino chain of effects. This piece of evidence should be as specific as possible. The best case scenario would be to have a card that literally talks about the specific Affirmative plan.

• Sometimes linking the Aff case to the Disad 
  TURNS THE CASE - it proves that rather than solve the harms, the Aff actually causes the harms. A TURN is an even better argument because it also attacks solvency while proving the impacts!!!

  Turns are OFFENSIVE arguments!
C. INTERNAL LINK

- The Internal Links are the “baby steps” between the other parts of the disad.

- These help the judge to understand how passing the affirmative plan will eventually lead to the impacts. Sometimes disadvantages ask us to make big leaps between arguments. The internal links fill in those gaps.

- There can be as many internal link cards as are necessary to make the Disad cohesive, but more cards also opens you up to more possible Aff attacks.
D. IMPACTS

• The Impacts are the really bad things that will happen after passing the Affirmative plan. These impacts are often set up in scenarios just like the Aff Harms scenarios. Sometimes the scenarios will include the internal link and the impact evidence together.

• Some Negative teams will use large scale impacts to try to “outweigh” the harms of the Affirmative case. Some judges, however, prefer more realistic harms that could actually result from passing a plan.
A LITTLE VISUAL.....

AFF PLAN

LINK

STATUS QUO

BRINK

...INTERNAL LINKS...

IMPACTS: the spiky spikes of death!
ARGUING THE IMPACTS

• There are a few things for the Negative to argue that will help the judge when determining whether or not to vote for the Disad.

Risk of the Advantages versus the Risk of the Disadvantages:
Does the risk of bad things happening outweigh the possibility of the good things happening?

Magnitude of the Impacts:
How big are the impacts? Usually measured in lives lost or saved / money lost or saved / resources lost or saved / etc.

Probability of Impacts:
How likely is it that the impacts will occur? The Neg. should argue that there is a 100% probability.

Timeframe of the Impacts:
How long before the impacts happen? Will they happen before the potential advantages to the Affirmative plan could happen?

RISK = MAGNITUDE x PROBABILITY
An Example of a Disad

A. **UNIQUENESS**

There is no constitutional right to education. Boaz 06.

DAVID BOAZ, MAY 1, 2006, Education and the Constitution
https://www.cato.org/blog/education-constitution
“Evidence Goes Here.”

B. **LINK**

Federal regulations threaten Federalism. Burke 16.

“Evidence Goes Here.”

C. **INTERNAL LINK**

Federalism is important for liberty. Wagner, 14.

“Evidence Goes Here.”

D. **IMPACTS**

Liberty is important to preventing the destruction of the United States.

D. Limbaugh 13.

*Evidence goes here*
Well, that pretty much covers the 1NC options for Offcase Arguments.

To recap, the 1NC ran: a Topicality Charge and a Disadvantage!

Let’s figure out how to swing the round back toward the Affirmative!
The 2nd Affirmative Const.

- The 2AC deals with answering all of the arguments that came out of the 1NC. Seems like a pretty big job, huh???
- There are some standard answers that a 2AC should make against any and all of these offcase positions.

Let’s go “STRAIGHT DOWN THE FLOW” and answer each of these. “THE FLOW” is the notes that debaters take during a round.

“GOING STRAIGHT DOWN THE FLOW” means that we will go step by step through every argument the 1NC made and give an answer, in order of how the notes were taken— it’s like an outline!

Don’t Worry!!!!!!

I’ll be giving you an example of how each of these flows should look on paper! Let’s start at the beginning…with Topicality.
2AC Answers to Topicality

Let’s briefly define the many answers that the 2AC should make:

1. **WE MEET** - this means that the 1AC actually “meets” the Negative definition. The 1AC should be topical according to how the Neg defined the word. EXPLAIN

2. **COUNTER DEFINITION** - the 2AC can also offer an alternative definition of the same word and EXPLAIN how the case is topical according to this definition. *The strategy of meeting the Neg definition and offering a counter definition provides 2 ways for the Affirmative case to be topical. Then the debate is over which is the better definition.*

3. **NO VIOLATION** - because the Aff case meets the Neg’s definition, then we do not violate the word. EXPLAIN

4. **ANSWER THE NEG’S STANDARDS** - go through each standard and explain why you uphold the standard or explain that it’s a bad standard.

5. **COUNTERSTANDARDS** - offer 3 of your own standards and argue that these are a better way of determining which is the best definition.

6. **VOTERS** - either T is a voting issue (and the Aff should win it because we are topical) or it is not a voting issue (and it shouldn’t matter because the Aff is topical). If it is a voting issue, you can use the same voters that the Negative offered.
Here’s how T will look “on the flow”

A. DEFINITION- INCREASE
Increase means to become greater.
American Heritage Dictionary 2000
http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/increase
to become greater or larger. To multiply; reproduce.

B. VIOLATION-
Despite the fact that the Aff case increases regulation, it decreases funding which violates the “increase” mandate in the resolution. The Aff can increase regulation and/or it can increase funding, but the resolution does not allow them to decrease regulation or funding.

Off the Definition…
1. We accept the Neg’s definition of Increase.
2. We Meet the Neg definition- the 1AC increases the regulation of the school voucher program by increasing regulation of the funding going to it.

Off the Violation…
We do not violate the word “increase” because we are substantially increasing regulation of the federal voucher program which is completely topical.
Ok….that about does it for Topicality. Eventually, that should take you 1 minute or less to complete. You want to leave as much time as possible to answer the other offcase arguments!

Now let’s talk about answering the disadvantage. Here again, there are standard answers you should always use.
Standard answers for the Disad

1. **Non-unique / Generic**: this means that the Disad is generic and could be run against any Affirmative. By virtue of being topical, the Aff would link.
2. **Non-unique**: the situation that the Neg claims is happening in the status quo is not true.
3. **No Link**: the case will not cause the Disad to happen; the Aff will not set off the domino chain of events.
4. **Link Turn**: the Aff case doesn’t cause bad things to happen, it actually solves for the link. Therefore, avoiding the impacts of the DA becomes an add-on advantage to the case.
5. **No Brink**: we are not teetering on the edge in the status quo.
6. **No Internal Links**: either the Disad shell does not offer internal links or the internal links don’t make sense.
7. **No Impacts**: if the Aff case does not link to the Disad, then the impacts will not happen.
8. **Empirically denied**: we’ve been in this situation before and the impacts did not happen. If it was going to occur, we would have seen it by now (Ex: overspending = nuc war).
9. **Impact turn**: the impacts are actually a good thing, and should be added as an advantage to the Aff case. *not used very often for obvious reasons!*
10. **No timeframe**: the Neg doesn’t tell us how long before we see the impacts occur.
11. **No threshold**: how much of the Aff case has to happen before we see the impacts?
12. **Risk of solvency outweighs the risk of the disadvantages**: the benefits of the Aff case are so great that it outweighs the potential bad things that might occur.
13. **Magnitude**: how big will the impacts actually be? Magnitude of advantages outweighs the disadvantage.
Answering the Disad Line-by-Line

A. **UNIQUENESS**
School Choice is inevitable in the status quo.
Powell, 17.
MARK POWELL, Jan. 4, 2017, Charter schools offer parents another option,
“Evidence Goes Here.”

1. President Trump’s budget wouldn’t even cover the whole cost of the voucher program. Turner ‘16.
School Vouchers 101: What They Are, How They Work — And Do They Work?, Corey Turner, December 7, 2016,

B. **LINK**
Plan threatens to end the school choice movement. Americans for Prosperity, 16.
Public Schools Embrace School Choice: But only within the public schools. FEB 17, 2016,
Americans For Prosperity,
https://americansforprosperity.org/public-schools-embrace-school-choice-but-only-within-the-public-schools/
“Evidence Goes Here.”

1. We agree. The Aff wants to block the school choice movement and here’s why:
Private Schools are no longer higher achieving than public schools. Dynarski, 16.
On negative effects of vouchers, Mark Dynarski, May 26, 2016,
https://www.brookings.edu/research/on-negative-effects-of-vouchers/
And that’s how you answer a Disad.
OK….we’re finally done with answering the Offcase positions in the 2nd Aff Constructive.

Now, the 2AC would be cross examined by the 1NC.

After this is the Negative Block…which means Division of Labor!
How does the Negative do that?
- The 2NC will run 8 minutes of brand new **ONCASE** arguments, which are arguments that deal with the **STOCK ISSUES**.

  +

  - The 1NR will use the 5 minutes to answer all of the **OFFCASE** arguments from the 2AC.

  = 13 minutes of different arguments without repeating each other

**THIS IS CALLED**
**THE EMORY SHIFT.**
How to Run 2NC ONCASE arguments

Running ONCASE arguments is all about the cards! You need to read LOTS of evidence. This will not only back up what you’re saying, but remember that you’re trying to overwhelm the 1AR. So, make as many arguments as you can.

The 2NC has a few options as far as attacking the case....

1. You can go straight down the flow on the case and attack each argument line-by-line-hit all of the stock issues. READ EVIDENCE
2. You can isolate certain stock issues and go straight down the flow answering each argument (for example: just attacking the Aff’s harms and solvency). READ EVIDENCE
3. You can present what’s called a “dump,” which is as many cards/analytics as you can possibly run. The difference with this is that it does not follow the 1AC flow, but is separate as its own argument. (for example: a solvency dump- independent voter). READ EVIDENCE
4. You can go down the flow attacking arguments and then present a dump separately. READ EVIDENCE

It really depends on what kind of evidence you can find against the case, and what works with the rest of your Negative strategy (i.e. the offcase arguments you ran).
Here are some very general answers against the Case… all of this, of course, requires EVIDENCE!

| **Significance** | • The harms are not significant. We shouldn’t worry about them.  
|                  | • There are more significant harms we should be focused on.   |
| **Harms**        | • The harms are not happening in the Status Quo.  
|                  | • The harms are decreasing in the Status Quo.  
|                  | • Turn: the Aff plan makes the harms worse.  
|                  | • The harms are not really harms.  |
| **Inherency**    | • The Status Quo is already solving for these harms in a better way.  
|                  | • The Aff plan is already happening in the Status Quo.  |
| **Solvency**     | • The Aff plan cannot solve the harms.  
|                  | • The Aff plan will cost too much- not enough funding.  
|                  | • The harms cannot be solved.  
|                  | • Turn: The Aff plan makes the problem worse.  |
| **Plan Attacks** | • The plan’s funding is insufficient.  
|                  | • There is no one to enforce the plan or it is insufficient.  |
REBUTTALS

After the 2NC, the 2A will do the cross examination.

Then, it’s time for the 1NR. This is the first rebuttal of the round. Remember that NO NEW ARGUMENTS may come up in the rebuttals. This is different from new evidence, which is fine.

…we’re halfway through!

Here are some general tips for what to do in the last four speeches of the round….
1AR: You are pressed for time....
   1. Cross-Apply previously read evidence whenever possible.
   2. Group arguments and answer them together when you can.
   3. DON”T DROP ANYTHING! If an argument goes unanswered in the
      1AR, it is lost to the Aff team. From here, the Neg can pick it up as a free
      win. For many judges, the Neg only has to win one argument to win the
      round. This can be as small as a single card.

2NR/2AR: You are the story-tellers...
   1. You still have to continue extending the answers on arguments.
   2. You also have to tell the story of the Aff case or the Neg arguments,
   3. Tell the judge which are the important arguments to consider when
      voting. This is called giving the VOTERS.
   4. Weigh the advantages versus the disadvantages,
   5. Present Impact Calculus...the effects of voting aff vs. the effects of
      voting neg. “What kind of a world will we live in if...?”
   6. Politely suggest to the judge why you should win the round!
Priority of Arguments in Rebuttals

VOTERS -
What does the world look like after this debate if you vote...
Aff?
Neg?

POST - FIAT WORLD -
Debate Land of Pretend Substantive Arguments
ie DA, CP, T, K, Stock Issues

PROCEDURAL -
Rules and Theory Arguments Topicality Charges
TOURNAMENT PROCEDURES

PRELIMINARY ROUNDS VS ELIMINATION ROUNDS:

Prelim Rounds are guaranteed (usually 3-4)
Elim Rounds are granted to the top teams based on W/L, Speaks, Ranks.
These are sudden elimination rounds and are generally paneled.

WIN/LOSS RECORD:
Each team will have a record based on the number of prelims won or lost.
4:0; 3:1; 2:2; 1:3; 0:4. It is in order of wins then losses.

SPEAKER POINTS AND RANKS
Each speaker will be given a number of speaker points. These are added per team for a total team number. Each speaker will also be ranked 1-4.
So... that's it for Basic Debate Theory.

All that's left is what's called JUDGE ADAPTATION.
There are 4 general types of judges....

You need to know these so that you can ADAPT to the kind of judge you have in each round. This is especially important in the Rebuttals. But, it does make a difference in what kind of arguments you choose to run.
STOCK ISSUES JUDGES

Stock Issues judges tend to be the more traditional debate judges.

These judges prefer:

- Stock Issue arguments (makes sense, right?!)
- Good Oncase discussion (esp. Solvency)
- Plan arguments (i.e. funding)

This does not mean you neglect the Offcase arguments. They are still important.

Usually the Neg only has to win one argument to take the round.

The Aff must win EVERY argument to take the round (burden of proof).
POLICY MAKERS

These tend to be the coaches and teachers.

These judges prefer:

Offcase arguments (esp. Disads and CPs)
Heavy on analysis of disads vs. advs
Like to compare a CP to a Case - which is the better policy with the most benefits?
Solvency/Adv vs. Solvency/Net Benefits
In the end, this judge will vote for Impact Calculus. ON A SCALE, does the Aff have enough benefits to risk the impacts, or is it better to stay with the Status Quo?
TABULA RASA (TABS)

These tend to be the college-aged judges. Tabula Rasa = Clean Slate
*Included here are GAMES judges

These judges prefer:
Any and every kind of argument (on and off)
Impact Calculus
Compare 1AC to CP
Adv vs Disads
Lots of Analysis
Clear Voters- you tell them what to vote on and they will look at what you ask them to *theoretically*
LAY JUDGES

These tend to be parents, bus drivers, custodians…whoever the tournament director can find!

Lay= novice…that does not mean that they are unintelligent, just untrained.

These judges prefer:
Lots of eye contact
Talking clearly and without jargon
Cut down on citing rules of debate
Persuasive speeches with lots of explanation
Good stories about the case or the Disads.
Basic arguments- don’t get crazy with Kritiks and CPs
They will vote for whoever convinced them the most
Judge Adaptation means that you:

1. Ask your judge what kind of **judging paradigm** (philosophy) he has BEFORE the round starts. If he doesn’t know what that is, assume he is probably a Lay Judge.

2. Listen to what your judge says, and **DO WHAT HE ASKS YOU TO!**

   If your judge says I’m a stock issues judge and I don’t like CPs…then don’t run one just because it’s what you always do.

3. Tailor your rebuttal analysis to what your judge will vote for. If your judge doesn’t like T, don’t spend 3 of your 5 minutes talking about it!

   Go for what you think THEY think you’re winning!
And that’s it! Debate is as easy as....