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Physical Layout of a Debate

For a debate to occur the following is required:

1. Two teams, one Affirmative/Proposition, one Negative/Opposition, each with two or three people.

2. An odd number of judges, preferably three or five. No ties are awarded this way.

3. A Chairperson/Timekeeper. This person is like the host of a talk show. The Chair (Moderator/Speaker) introduces the debaters and topic, starts the debate, introduces the respective speakers, and at the end, announces the Judges’ decision. The Chairperson/Timekeeper also times the speeches and signals to the speaker, through a sign or signal, the amount of speaking time left.

4. A room with sufficient furniture to ensure that everyone has a seat and a bit of table space. Only one debate should occur at a time in a room; otherwise, it will be impossible to concentrate.

![Diagram of debate layout](image.png)
Glossary of Terms

**Affirmative/Government/Proposition** – the team that argues in favour of the resolution

**Arguments/Contentions** – the propositions, introduced in the constructive speeches, through which debaters construct their cases

**B.I.R.T.** – a commonly used abbreviation for ‘Be it resolved that . . .’, a standard phrase which proceeds some debate resolutions

**Case** – all of the elements that comprise a team’s strategic approach to a resolution

**CASE** – A way of remembering the components of a case line: C - the case statement A - the arguments S - the strategy E - the process of exposition (clash and case analysis)

**Case Line Statement** – the main point a team is proving. Both the negative and the affirmative have a case line statement, and that statement must agree with the side of the resolution they are on. Also known as a case thesis.

**Clash** – the fundamental point-counterpoint progression of a debate; two teams continually attempt to undermine each other’s individual points by presenting more convincing arguments for their own side. Clash can be a direct attack on one point through another point (see direct clash), an attack on several points by addressing the underlying idea (see global clash) or an attack of the underlying principle of an entire side of a debate (see case line).

**Comparative Advantage Case** – a case where the affirmative attempts to prove their plan is superior to the current system but not perfect. The plan must meet the goals the current system is based on.

**Constructive Speech** – a speech in a debate when debaters present new contentions to build their cases

**Criteria Case** – a case where the affirmative argues that any solution to the problem presented in the resolution must meet a set criteria they have devised. The criteria become the standard that the current system has failed to meet (replacing needs for change) and the plan must meet the criteria.

**Definition of Terms** – may limit the terms of the resolution but must be reasonable; are presented in the first affirmative speech to provide a common basis for discussion. Definitions in values debates may contain the idea of “how” the resolution would be implemented or be followed by a brief model.

**Definitional Challenge** – occurs when the first negative speaker claims that the affirmative definitions are unfair or illogical and then introduces and attempts to substantiate better ones

**Direct Clash** – is a type of attack where one argument is specifically refuted using another

**Evidence** – is a statistic, quotation or case study (example) to support an argument you are making. Be sure you understand not only what the evidence says, but the reason for saying it and the context. Remember that all arguments must be substantiated with either evidence or logic.

**Forgotten Actors** – a method to generate arguments. Consider all the individual people, groups, communities, organizations, institutions, businesses, and governments possibly affected at the personal, local, regional, national and international levels.

**Global Clash** – is a type of refutation where several points in an opponent's case are attacked through one point that strikes at assumptions

**Goals Case** – a case where the affirmative looks at the stated goals of the current system (they must be formal written goals found in policy or legislation) and proves the current system does not meet those goals (replacing the need for change. The plan introduced by the affirmative meets the goals).

**LEET** – a way of remembering the parts of an argument: Label, Explanation, Evidence, Tie-back
Logic – a method of proving an argument to be true. Logic uses clear, defensible statements that work together to create a point. The statements cannot rest on other points that are unproven (fallacy) or on themselves (circular argument). Remember that all arguments must be substantiated with either evidence or logic. See SEDA’s resources on logic on page 58 for more detailed information.

Model – brief course of action proposed after the definitions by the Proposition to show how the resolution could be implemented or has been implemented elsewhere; used in Values debates.

Needs case – the affirmative identifies 3 reasons to change (needs) and suggests a plan to meet that need

Negative/Opposition – the team that argues against the resolution

Plan – in Policy debates, a detailed course of action proposed to implement the resolution, and outlined by the first affirmative speaker and explained in detail by the second affirmative speaker. The negative may propose a counter-plan if they agree there is a problem but think they have a better solution. (Rarely used in current debates).

Policy debate – a debate about what should be done, why and how. A policy debate may require a brief model to answer the question how.

Rebuttal – the affirmative or negative concluding speech that is used for summary and refutation only and not for the development of new contentions

Refutation – the process of proving that the other teams arguments are incorrect or illogical

Resolution – the subject to be resolved through debate

SPLEEEEM – an acronym for remembering types of arguments you can use in a debate. They include:
S - social  P - political  L - legal  E - economic  E - environmental  E - education  E - ethical
M - moral  M – medical  M – military  M – media

Status Quo – a Latin term that refers to the present established system

Summary/Reply – final speeches similar to a rebuttal speech, but will have a slower tempo and shift in tone from the rest. These speeches examine the big picture and point out the crux of the debate.

Thesis – the main point a team is proving. Both the negative and the affirmative have a case line statement, and that statement must agree with the side of the resolution they are on. Also known as a case line statement.

THW / THB / THS – This House would / believes / should, etc… a standard phrase which proceeds some debate resolutions and generally interpreted to mean Canada, or parts of the world (western countries, developing nations, etc), depending on the subject of the rest of the resolution.

Values Debate – a genre of debate based on asking and answering the big question of “why” we should take an action and not about “how to implement” a change – both sides may have equally valid but conflicting beliefs but defend why they are “more right”. Most SEDA resolutions are now Values ones.

Why Well – method of asking questions to break down an idea to find the ultimate, defendable truth of a statement. Ask why (or other questions) to explain each step of an argument.

Copied with permission from Alberta Debate and Speech Association; revised 2013 by SEDA
Building a Case

PART ONE
Central Issues

All debates are related to a series of central issues. The issues are essentially unsolvable because there are two good positions, and which one is right depends on many things. You will win if you:

• identify the underlying issue (central issue)
• state your position on it
• defend that position better than your opponents do

Both sides must have a main argument and relate their points to it. Merely clashing with your opponents’ arguments is no longer sufficient to win a debate. Similarly, having a series of unrelated points is a weak constructive speech.

Identifying Central or Underlying Issues in Debate

A central issue is a big idea that societies base choices on. They can be common values or ideologies. They always have two valid but opposite ideas in them.

For each resolution, look at some central issues and try to see if they relate to the resolution. You will know you have a good underlying issue when it captures what the debate is about for you.

After getting the resolution:
1. Ask: “Why are we having this debate?”
2. Brainstorm a list of central issues.
3. Decide what the two positions in each central issue are
4. Pick central issues where the positions match the debate in the resolution

There are a number of common issues underlying all debates. Here are a few examples:
(More examples can be found on page 48)
• Individual freedom versus group security
  1. Position 1 – the individual has the right to make choices that are the best for him or her. Society must not interfere with the choices a person makes.
  2. Positions 2 – A society must protect itself. If individuals threaten society, the rights of the group are more important.
  3. Common resolutions:
     - Locker searches
     - Terrorism
     - Censorship
• The ends versus the means
  1. Positions 1 – How we do things is the most important factor in judging if what we did was good.
  2. Positions 2 – What happens at the end is more important than what you do to make it happen
  3. Common resolutions:
     - Euthanasia
     - War time choices
     - Spanking

Once you have identified the central issues, choose one central issue to build your case around.

PART TWO
Building Cases

A case is built around a central issue. It is a philosophical position supported by a series of arguments.

What is a case?
• A position on a central issue
• The main point that your side of the debate is proving (thesis or case line statement)
AND
• Supporting arguments that show the main point is true

How do I know what my case should be?
• You think about why the debate is happening. All debates are a part of bigger debates about what is the right way to approach things (central ideas), and you pick the best one or ones
• You find why the debate is happening, then construct a thesis (your point) that states the problem
• You support your thesis with key arguments that prove your thesis about the nature of the problem is correct

Example:
BIRT that school uniforms be mandatory

Step 1 – Determine the central issue in our society
Are the rights of the group or the individual more important?

Step 2 – Think about the main points for each side and choose your main point (case)

Affirmative Case - Uniforms protect students from being targeted by other students.
Negative Case - Uniforms prevent students from expressing their individuality.

Step 3 – Support your case with arguments

Affirmative Case Line – Uniforms are an important tool that helps us protect our children
Argument 1 – Affordability and Status (economics)
Argument 2 – Gangs and safety (criminal/legal)
Argument 3 – Appropriate dress (moral)
Argument 4 – Improved academic success (educational)

Negative Case Line – Uniforms prevent our children from becoming strong individuals.
Argument 1 – Create artificial experiences (social)
Argument 2 – Prevent self-discovery (educational)
Argument 3 – Violates freedom of choice (legal)
Argument 4 – Creates the illusion of homogeneity (moral)

Once you understand how to chose a central argument and a case, you are ready to learn how to make a good case line statement and support it with a good variety of arguments.

PART THREE
Case Line and Arguments

What is a Case Line?

A case is your main constructive point and the things that support it. A case line is formal organization that tells others about your case. For a judge to understand all of your ideas, you need to present them in a simple and predictable structure. This is called your case line.

A case line includes:
• The thesis comes from your case, but is more specific and represents a position. It summarizes all your points. This is called either the case line statement or the thesis.
• The thesis or case line statement is simple, catchy and clear.
• All your argument directly support your case line statement. This means:
  ▪ The arguments prove your case line
  ▪ The arguments come from the same central idea as your case line
  ▪ Do not use arguments that do not meet these criteria. They are either irrelevant (red herrings) or they actually contradict your case. Both things could case you to lose the debate

A case line statement includes the position of the team and why they believe in their position.

• Case idea: Capital punishment should be reinstated for the benefit of all Canadians.
• Case line statement: Capital Punishment saves lives.

Case line statement + arguments + evidence = Case line

Choosing a good case line

Once you have the elements of a case line, you need to check and be sure the case line is a good one. A good case line:

☐ Can be backed up with arguments from at least 3 SPLEEEM categories
☐ Takes the moral or practical high ground
Solves a clear problem

Is a based on philosophical position (case), not a point (argument)

Is exciting for you to debate

Building arguments

An argument is a proposition or contention that is used to prove a case line. It is developed through explanation and supported by evidence.

If the case line is Capital punishment saves lives:
- **Argument:** Known killers can’t re-offend
- **Development:** You can’t escape, be released or commit crimes in jail when you are dead.
- **Evidence:** Statistics on the number of murderers who kill again.

For practice in building arguments, complete the quiz at the end of this unit or online at www.saskdebate.com/caseline/examples/argument_development.htm

Types of Arguments - SPLEEEM

Cases should have a variety of diverse arguments. Debaters have developed the short hand **SPLEEEEMM** to remember the types of arguments:
- Social
- Political
- Legal
- Economical
- Environmental
- Educational (or Ethical)
- Moral (or Medical)
- Military
- Media

A case is stronger and less susceptible to attack if there are several types of arguments. If all of the arguments were moral, all the opposition would have to do is discount the whole idea that morals are important to the debate.

A short quiz illustrates how to incorporate different arguments into a case:

Let's assume that Canada had not yet legalized gay marriage. If the resolution asked for it to be legalized, the case line might be that the legalization of gay marriage is consistent with Canadian Society.

Name SPLEEEM category that each of the following arguments would fit under:
A-Moral  B-Political  C-Social  D-Legal

2. "Canada is a secular society and we believe the state has no place in the bedrooms of the nation."
3. "We must treat minorities in the way we would want to be treated in a similar circumstance."

**Answers:** 1. D; 2. C; 3. A

**How do I know if I have a good argument?**

Good arguments state the argument, use evidence or logic to expand it and tie it to the case statement. Failure to tie an argument to the case statement is the most common error debaters make once they learn to make a case line. You can use the following steps to see if your argument supports your case line:

1. Write down your thesis (case line statement)
2. Write down what things would have to be true for your thesis to be right (given assumptions)
3. Check that your arguments do not contradict the given assumptions
4. Check that your arguments prove the given assumptions

Discard any arguments that do not meet the steps, and be sure you have 3-5 arguments when you are done

**Case Line** - a philosophy of thinking about debate and a method of structuring the
arguments made by a team. The case is considered in a broad context, then a case line statement (like a thesis) is generated. Finally three or four arguments to support the case line statement are generated.

- Define resolution: BIRT Canada legalize Euthanasia.
- State thesis: We have the right to determine our own destiny based on our own values, as long as it does not cause greater harm to others

- Arguments:
  1. Canadians have an inherent right to life, liberty and security, which extends to the right to die (legal Charter argument)
  2. Canadians believe in freedom of belief and practice of belief (moral argument)
  3. The potential harm from Euthanasia does not outweigh the benefits (moral pre-emptive argument)

Having a case line is not the same as using that case line. Common errors include:
- stating a case line but never returning to it after each argument
- building arguments that do not follow the case line statement
- not having a case line on the negative and just running a clash case
- failure to clash with an opponent's case line

Presenting your case

It is very possible that in a debate, your opponents, and most importantly, your judges, will be unfamiliar with the Case Line model of debate. They will be used to the Needs-Plan Model and its variants.

It becomes very important for the affirmative to clearly explain this approach and outline what they are doing, without being too obvious, like saying “now I will tell you our case line thesis statement…”.

Remember, you still want to have an interesting hook to open your speech. You need to sign post, so everyone knows how you and your partner have split the arguments between the two of you. Generally, the first speaker will take two arguments and the second speaker will cover one, along with the bulk of deconstruction. Also, the arguments are split along SPL EEEM lines. Maybe you have two really strong economic arguments, leaving the social one for your partner.

When signposting, give each of your arguments a snappy label that describes the main point of the argument, so you can easily refer to them. Once you start laying out your arguments, remember there is a pattern to presenting them. State the argument, explain it, give evidence to support the argument, and remember to always tie back the argument to the case statement. At SEDA’s day camp, this model was nicknamed “LEET”. Refer to the case building worksheet at the end of this Unit to ensure you have prepared all the steps for a strong case.

Moral High Ground

In a debate it is important to appear as if you care about what will happen as a result of your ideas. There are many types of high ground you might have in debate. Your ideas might help stimulate the economy or reduce unemployment, which gives you the economic high ground.

Persuasive Language

To persuade, carefully choose your words and vocabulary. Consider the connotations of words, for both the affirmative and negative sides. Are they loaded with emotion, or more neutral? The words you select can minimize the impact made by your opponents.

For example, compare:
condemned, murderer vs. convict
travesty vs. errors
concentration camps vs. detention centers
LEET – Creating Caselines & Arguments

Summary

In debate both sides have to create arguments to defend either side of the case.

Brainstorm a list of ideas why. Do not judge any of the ideas, just list them all. Divide your sheet into two columns and try to arrange the ideas as for or against the resolution. You want to ask:

Why is the debate happening?
What is the bigger issue at stake?
What is the “right way” to solve this problem?

You will probably get a range of simple ideas to fairly sophisticated reasons. Ideas will be for or against the resolution.

Once you have a good list, start grouping major ideas together and try to pick out the major theme of each group. You should get themes coming forth like: personal security and personal freedom. Use the “Why Well” technique to dig deeper. Some points will form the case line, others will form arguments or be discarded.

For both the “for” and the “against” side, develop a “case line” statement that supports a position (thesis). The statement should have 3 parts and is usually simple, catchy and clear.

State the important part of the resolution; State “because”; State the reason or thesis

Proposition: We need to change the policy because we must ensure the personal security of students

Opposition: We must keep the current policy because individual freedom is most important

The case line statement will create a refrain that is the framework for the speech and should be easy to repeat often. Check your case line against the criteria:

- Can be backed up with arguments from at least 3 SPLEEEEMMM Categories
- What things would have to be true for your thesis to be right (given assumptions)
- Takes the moral or practical high ground
- Solves a clear problem
- Is a philosophical position, not a point

An argument has four parts:

Label (catchy reference)
Explain (bulk of an argument showing the logic connections)
Examples/Evidence (statistics, quotes, studies, stories etc)
Tie back (to the case line – why this debate is important and how this argument supports it)

Check your arguments against the criteria

- Your arguments support the caseline statement (thesis)
- Your arguments do not contradict the given assumptions
- Your arguments prove the given assumptions.

Example argument – “Not a deterrent” (Label)
Ladies and gentlemen, regardless what the Proposition side tells you, the death penalty does NOT stop criminals. It is not an effective deterrent because these criminals are too hardened to care.

Allow me to explain. The people that the Proposition is targeting, the murderers, will not be deterred. To them, being put to death is an easy way out. They have already forfeited their lives, they have no reason to live.

Taken from the Nation wide murder rates in the United States, the average murder rate for a state that does NOT have the death penalty is 4.2 while the murder rate for the states that DO have the death penalty is 5.9. This is significantly higher and proves that the death penalty is NOT an effective deterrent.

This is evidence ladies and gentlemen. This proves the Opposition caseline that The Death Penalty does nothing to stop murders and that the money wasted on the death penalty should be put to better use within the society.

Three Tips to brainstorm arguments:
Think SPLEEEEMMM reasons:
Social, Political, Legal,
Economic, Environmental, Educational, Ethical,
Moral, Military, Medical, Media

Forgotten Actors: Think of all the people impacted by the resolution

Geographical circles: Think local, provincial, national, global
List of Common Cases

• Individual freedom versus group security
  1. Position 1 – the individual has the right to make choices that are the best for him or her. Society must not interfere with the choices a person makes.
  2. Positions 2 – A society must protect itself. If individuals threaten society, the rights of the group are more important.
  3. Common resolutions:
     - Locker searches
     - Terrorism
     - Censorship

• The ends versus the means
  1. Positions 1 – How we do things is the most important factor in judging if what we did was good.
  2. Positions 2 – What happens at the end is more important than what you do to make it happen
  3. Common resolutions:
     - Euthanasia
     - War time choices
     - Spanking

• Rights versus responsibilities
  1. Position 1 – The most important issue is what you can be free do without other people interfering
  2. Position 2 – The most important issue is what you should do instead of what you can do
  3. Common resolutions
     - Environmental issues
     - Foreign Aid
     - Role of the press

• Majority versus minority
  1. Position 1 – The majority of people decide what the group should do, and the minority must follow what the majority says
  2. Position 2 – The minority must be protected from the control of the majority
  3. Common resolutions
     - Multiculturalism
     - Aboriginal self-government
     - Integration

• Legal versus ethical
  1. Position 1 – We must do what the law says we should
  2. Position 2 – We should do what we know is right
  3. Common resolutions
     - Civil disobedience
     - Gay marriage
     - Environmental issues

Continued…
List of Common Cases (continues)

- Control versus natural evolution
  1. Position 1 – We should plan how to meet our goals and change things to meet our plan
  2. Position 2 – What will be will be, and we should not interfere
  3. Common resolutions
     - Economic issues
     - Environmental issues
     - Welfare

- Cost versus gains
  1. Position 1 – We should do the thing that costs us the least
  2. Position 2 – We should do the thing that gives us the most benefits
  3. Common resolutions
     - Capital Punishment
     - Heath care
     - Gun registry

Others?

Continue to add to the list as you discover other common cases and their typical resolutions.
Deconstruction

**Objective**

| To help debaters know how to deconstruct a case. |

| Usually referred to as “refutation”, deconstruction encompasses a much broader scope of clash. |

**Instructor**

| PART ONE

**Deconstruction**

The process of exposing, which is also known as clash, is the process of breaking down or deconstructing an opponent's argument.

Beginner flow sheets only look at what your opponents have said and what you might say. They support direct clash. Because debate is two big premises in contradiction, in addition to just arguments, more experienced debaters need to deconstruct cases using three types of clash: direct clash, global clash and case clash.

Remember that different types of clash are effective for different types of deconstructing:

**Direct Clash** – Use to attack a particularly vulnerable argument

- a type of attack where one argument is specifically refuted using another

- **Affirmative point:** Abortion is the act of killing a person and people have a right to life.

- **Negative direct clash:** A fetus is not a person, but the woman is. She has a right to control her own body.

**Global Clash** – Use to attack the underlying philosophy of an argument and to attack groups of arguments with one clash point

- a type of refutation where several points in an opponent's case are attacked through one point that strikes at assumptions

- **Affirmative points:** You can't re-offend if you are dead so lives are saved. You will be less likely to commit murder if you know you will die, so lives are saved.

- **Negative global clash:** Lives will still be lost because capital punishment is a punishment not a prevention. It is better to prevent the murders by altering the social conditions that encourage murder.

**Case Clash** – Use to attack the philosophy of an opponent’s case (if you defeat the principle, you don’t need to attack the examples!)

- a type of refutation where the case construction of one side is designed so that it automatically disagrees with the case construction of the other

- For example, imagine the resolution is about legalizing abortion, and the affirmative case line is that we must protect the rights of the unborn. A negative case line that we must protect the reproductive rights of women will automatically clash with the affirmative case
Learning to use all three types of clash can be complicated. To be a good at clash you must be able to:

- decide which of your opponents' points are most important
- select the most effective method of clash
- use that method well

**Clashing with opponents is a lot like attacking a tree:**

- Direct clash cuts of one branch
- Global clash cuts several branches that extend from the same assumption
- Case line clash destroys the roots of the argument, and the tree will fall even when the branches are still attached

The best way to learn how to clash is by practice. The following exercises and quizzes will help. Visit SEDA’s web site for the answers and further discussion:

**Listen to a speech and try the types of clash:**

1. [Listen to the speech](http://www.saskdebate.com/caseline/deconstruction_case_line.htm) at www.saskdebate.com/caseline/deconstruction_case_line.htm or have the coach or other debaters present a good example and keep a flow chart of the arguments.

2. Record the arguments in the *them* category, and write your suggested clash in the *us* category.

3. When you are done, look at the chart you created. Label the clash you planned to use as direct, global or case line.

**Key Questions:**

1. What type of clash do you use most often and why?
2. What forms of clash should be used most often?
3. Why is deconstruction essential to a debate?

As mentioned in Unit 4 on flow sheeting, at this level, the flow sheet must become more complex. Flow sheeting is not just about writing down every word an opponent says, it should be a logical diagram of the key points of the debate.

Debaters need to track each of the arguments presented by debaters and their team’s response, across the whole debate. This is where sign posting becomes very important.

The flow sheet should identify which arguments need direct clash, which ones can be grouped together and attacked with global clash, and what part of their case is the thesis, and underlying assumptions, so they can be attacked with case clash.

The flow sheet also needs to track a team’s own constructive points and the response of the other team, so debaters know where they are vulnerable to attack as well.
After completing the clash tests, recall that **CASE** has four parts:

- **C** - the case statement
- **A** - the arguments
- **S** - the strategy
- **E** - the process of exposing (not the fun kind)

**E** is the process of exposing - it occurs in clash and final speeches. We will be looking at using all the parts of **CASE** in the next Unit on final speeches.

The final part of **CASE** is

- **E** - the process of exposing, which is clash and case line analysis.

Case analysis is the process of putting the debate in perspective. It has a basic structure in a reply speech:

1. Restate the case line in a new broader sense. This is like re-stating your thesis in the conclusion of an essay.
2. Highlight the underlying issue of the debate (case line clash).
3. Show how your main three arguments remain standing and reinforce your thesis about the underlying issue.
4. Show how the fundamental principle of the opponent’s case line is wrong.
5. Global clash with 1-3 key arguments.
6. Put the debate into perspective and answer the question – “Why does it matter?”

**Internal Logic of a Case**

Debate is a team sport. Each idea presented by every debater on a side must be consistent with all the other ideas and follow the case line. If debaters raise ideas that are not relevant or internally contradictory, they harm their own side. In the example below, two partners are actually refuting each other:

**Resolution**: “BIRT: School uniforms be mandatory”

**Negative One**: “School uniforms should not be used because they give the illusion that we are all the same. Students don’t learn how to deal with differences.”

**Assumption**: Uniforms make us see the world in an unrealistic manner.

**Negative Two**: “School uniforms don’t actually fix the problem. Poor kids are still bullied in schools with uniforms. Kids see through that stuff.”

**Assumption**: Uniforms don’t affect how we see the world.

The debaters have actually clashed with each other; the other team did not even need to clash with them! Not only do they appear confused, they make all of their other arguments seem weak.

**Avoiding logical erosion**

Always test everything you say against your case line. If it does not agree with your case line or is not relevant to it, DO NOT say it.

When you construct your case, try to anticipate common arguments against it and test your responses to be sure they are logically consistent. If an argument comes up during the debate and you haven’t had time think it through but need to clash, say “one of the possible effects” or “either x or y may occur”.

If the debaters in example one had argued that uniforms were negative because they always failed to solve the problem they were designed to address, the arguments would have been fine. Either students don’t care about the uniforms so they are irrelevant or students do care and don’t develop life skills.
Format your arguments to avoid absolutes and focus on case statements.

Summary

Clash can be direct, global or imbedded in the case line. Each type of clash has a specific purpose. If the Negative has a constructive case, good case line clash happens automatically and makes the job of the Affirmative much more difficult.

In any debate, the primary form of deconstruction should be global clash because it is the most efficient and shows higher-level skills than direct clash. A good debater does not use direct clash as the default method of clashing.

Case line gives you the advantage of offering positive reasons in your clash, not negative ones as in a needs case.

Principles of a good case line:

- Brings the debate back to the major underlying principle
- Relates to the case and split
- Concise
- Memorable & catchy
- Holds the moral high ground
- Is not an assertion

Why case lines are good:

- Keeps the debate on track
- Test arguments against it
- Team cohesion & unity
- Judges understand
- Deconstruction and clash is easier
- Case is easier to prove
- Case is easier to understand
- Sets team stance/position

Eleven Common Logical Errors

1. Faulty Premises
2. Faulty Conclusion.
3. Composition
4. *Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc*
5. Fallacy of Common Cause
6. *Ad Hominem*
7. Straw Man
8. False Dilemma
9. *Reductio Ad Absurdem*
10. Improper Appeal to Practice
11. Faulty Analogy

Adapted from the Alberta Debate and Speech Association Senior High Advanced Strategy Booklet on Debate

Clash Points

1. Inconsistencies in statements and logic
2. Statements that are unsupported or underdeveloped
3. Validity of any point
4. Validity of logic
5. Quality of evidence
6. Has a real need for change been established
7. Feasibility of the action items
8. What disadvantages would be created by their case?
9. Does their case represent a net loss?
10. Overall, where does their case lead (a better society or worse one)?

Adapted from the Alberta Debate and Speech Association Senior High Advanced Strategy Booklet on Debate
## REFUTATION CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Refutation</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenging the Problem</strong></td>
<td>Opponent doesn't understand the real issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent doesn't deal with the real issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenging the Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Opponent overlooked important parts of issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent doesn't understand consequences of issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent looking at issue from the wrong angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent's argument based on false/fatal assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem with authority of evidence</strong></td>
<td>Person is not specialized in the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person's bias is questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person's research is not conclusive in results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person's research methods is questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem with statistic</strong></td>
<td>Statistic of too small sample group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic of too narrow sample group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic inconsistent with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic used biased questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic of different group of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic is irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corollary Argument</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate opposite results from argument of opponent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No relationship --&gt; no cause and effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimization/Mitigation</strong></td>
<td>Opponent used extremes to prove case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent only used isolated incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;So what&quot; - benefits outweigh consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact actually good not bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special arguments</strong></td>
<td>Opponent is using circular reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent is appealing to prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent is appealing to habit/ritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent is contradicting previous argument/speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent's principles lead to unwanted precedent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent's actions will inevitable lead to bad results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent's suggestions of 2 options false, 3rd available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Created by Vinay Kumar Mysore, 2004
PART ONE
Case Line and Final Speeches

Debates are often won or lost in the final speech. That speech has to put the whole debate in context, summarize your side and complete the attack on your opponents. In case line, that speech is a reply. It uses elements of the traditional rebuttal and the lowly summary, but also focuses on case line analysis.

This is your last chance to persuade the judges that your team presented the best case.

While a rebuttal speech tends to be a rapid-fire repetition of all the points on both sides, in a reply speech, debaters will slow down, “step-back” and change the pacing, tone and style.

The reply is a big-picture examination of what happened in the debate. Debaters will use language that makes it sound like they already won. They will point out what the key issues were on each side, and what the “crux” of the debate was really about, rather than focus on details. They will try to twist or reframe their opponents’ case in a negative light and show how their team did everything right that is needed to win.

Debaters using the Case Line Model need to know how to differentiate between a rebuttal and a reply.

In all of Saskatchewan’s styles of debate either a reply or a rebuttal may be deliver in the final address from each side. In other places, either a rebuttal or a reply is required. Because reply speeches require a stronger understanding of the entire debate and greater experience with debate in general, reply speeches are typically mastered after a debater learns to deliver a good rebuttal. If a debater is using a case line, a reply must be used.

Listen to the opening statements of the sample rebuttal and a reply speeches and think about the following questions listed below.

Questions:
• What is the role of the final speech on each side of a debate?
• What makes an effective concluding speech?
• What type of final speech do you usually do?
• What skills must a debater have to do a rebuttal? A reply?

Resolution: This house believes that low taxes are preferable to extensive government services

Negative case line: Social Services are beneficial to society in both an economic and humanitarian sense.
PART TWO
Sample Speeches
A sample Negative rebuttal:

Ladies and Gentlemen, we have shown that lower taxes should not come at the price of social programs. Our opponents stated that taxes are too high, but they are not as high as many other places. Our opponents also argued that things like our health care system are not working and we should let people pay for better service. However, this also means some people get no service like in the United States. Do we want a country of people who are petrified about losing their health benefits? We on the negative do not want to live in that kind of world. You may think that our opponents are correct when they state that many people abuse social services. But what about the child who needs to eat or the elderly woman on a fixed income? Are they abusing the system? No! As my partner has proven, the vast majority of Canadians need the social services they get. Finally, the Affirmative has argued that lower taxes will stimulate growth in the economy and we will all be better off. As I stated in my first speech, what lower taxes really do is increase the gap between those with money and those without. The working poor can afford less and the wealthy can afford more. Clearly my opponents’ argument is based on faulty economics. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Negative has proven to you today that the ideas of the Affirmative would rip apart the fabric of our society. We have shown that the current system is superior even if it has its faults. This resolution must fall.

Steps to building a reply speech:
• put the debate in perspective
• distil the opponents’ case line, and put it in a negative light
• restate own case line including three major constructive points
• attack the fundamental principle of an opponents’ case
• rebuild the principle of your own case
• conclude with case line and why it matters

A sample Negative reply:

Ladies and Gentlemen, the issue here today is the best way to invest in the future of Canadians. (perspective) My opponents believe in the principle of every man for himself. (distil) We on the Negative contend that pooling our money is the best way to invest from not only an economic perspective, but also with regards to quality of service and quality of life. (restate) The Affirmative has focused their argument on the basic Keynesian principle that giving people more spending money through less taxes has huge economic benefits. They have contended that this outweighs the value of social programming. This viewpoint is fundamentally short-sighted. Education is a classic social program. It is funded almost completely through taxes, and those taxes are an investment in our future. As these young people achieve high levels of learning and join the economy, they are what really stimulate growth. Rather than a short-term increase in consumer spending, we could achieve a capable workforce with the resources to both make and spend higher income. Any good capitalist will tell you that you need to spend money to make money. Because the need to stimulate the economy is best met by the Negative case and not the Affirmative, the basic tenant of their case falls. (attack) In addition, the clear benefits of social programming remain undiminished. Public sector care is best across the entire spectrum. Yes, the Affirmative is right the rich Americans receive more timely care and better access to health care. But the majority of American’s struggle to meet their health care needs and the care that 20% of Americans receive is considered a travesty in Canada. Finally, social programs are intrinsic as a part of Canadian values. We are ultimately a people that care about the equal treatment of all, and the future of our children. (rebuild) Money put into one needy child does not merely feed that child; it provides that child with the opportunity to feed others when she becomes an adult. The Affirmative case cannot stand on the basis of economics and is destroyed on the basis of human decency. We could never support this resolution. (conclude)
# Styles & Speaking times

**Cross-Examination Style** *(Intermediate, Junior, Novice and Open)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Affirmative Constructive</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Affirmative Cross-Examined by 1st Negative</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>3 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Negative Constructive</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Negative Cross-Examined by 2nd Affirmative</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>3 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Affirmative Constructive</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Affirmative Cross-Examined by 2nd Negative</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>3 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Negative Constructive</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Negative Cross-Examined by 1st Affirmative</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>3 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Rebuttal</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>4 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Rebuttal</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>4 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parliamentary Style** *(Junior, Novice and Open)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister’s Introduction</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Opposition Speech</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>8 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Government Speech</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>8 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader of the Opposition’s Speech <em>(The last 3 minutes of this speech are a rebuttal)</em></td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>8 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Prime Minister’s Rebuttal</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>3 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**British Parliamentary Style with POIs** *(Intermediate, Junior, Novice and Open)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All eight speakers</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>5 min. preliminary rounds or 7 min. final rounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Style** *(Junior, Novice and Open)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All four constructive speeches</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>8 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary/Rebuttal speeches</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>4 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Worlds Style** *(Intermediate, Junior, Novice and Open)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All six constructive speeches</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>8 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary/Rebuttal speeches</td>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>4 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the Complete Step Guide for detailed descriptions
"Step by Step" Checklist for Cross-Examination Style (Case line & Global Clash)

First Affirmative Constructive Checklist
1. Hook your audience with a good introduction
2. State resolution
3. Define terms of resolution
4. Sign post:
   Label your three arguments and indicate how they will be divided between you and your partner
5. Present your case line
6. Present, explain and prove your first two arguments (LEET)
7. Tie-back your case to your case line
8. Say “I will now stand for cross-examination.” Remain standing.

Second Affirmative Constructive Speech
1. Sign post the order you intend to construct or deconstruct, and the last major argument you are going to make
2. Incorporate admissions from cross-examination and deconstruct (clash)
3. Put forth your final argument (LEET)
4. Advance the first two arguments
5. Tie your case back to your case line
6. Say “I will now stand for cross-examination.” Remain standing.

Cross-Examination Period
Second Affirmative speaker is cross-examined by the Second Negative speaker.

Second Negative Constructive Speech
1. Sign post the order you intend to construct or deconstruct, and the last major argument you are going to make
2. Incorporate admissions from cross-examination and deconstruct (clash)
3. Put forth your final argument (LEET)
4. Advance the first two arguments
5. Tie your case back to your case line
6. Say “I will now stand for cross-examination.” Remain standing.

Cross-Examination Period
Second Negative speaker is cross-examined by the First Affirmative speaker.

First Negative Constructive Speech
1. Argue Affirmative definitions of terms (if necessary). If you disagree with the definitions you must say so in your first speech. Otherwise the assumption is that you accept the definitions. You cannot first accept the definitions and later reject them! So there!
2. Sign post your strategy
   You have the option of presenting your own constructive case first, or dealing with the deconstruction then moving on. Indicate how the constructive arguments will be divided between the partners.
3. Present your case line, incorporate any admissions, etc. from the cross-ex period, put forth the first two arguments of your constructive case (LEET) and deconstruct (clash) the previous speech
4. Say “I will now stand for cross-examination.” Remain standing.

Cross-Examination Period
First Negative speaker is cross-examined by the First Affirmative speaker.

5 minute break

Negative / Affirmative Reply Speeches (Given by 1st speaker on each team)
1. Put the debate in perspective
2. Distil the opponents’ case line, and put it in a negative light
3. Restate own case line including three major constructive points
4. Attack the fundamental principle of an opponents’ case
5. Rebuild the principle of your own case
6. Conclude with case line and why it matters
### Some Points to Keep In Mind

- **a)** All questions should be related to central issues. Questions should be prepared with regard to the type of admissions or information you wish to obtain.

- **b)** Preparation must be thorough enough to enable one to deal with unexpected answers.

- **c)** Questions should be specific, and the intent should be clear. Questions should not be open-ended, permitting long answers by witnesses.

- **d)** Plan a series of questions to deal with anticipated weak areas.

- **e)** Type or write questions on file cards or in a small notebook.

- **f)** Address the audience and judges as well as the examiner.

- **g)** All questions fairly asked should be answered in the same fashion. Stalling, irrelevancy, flippancy or answering questions with another question are quite unacceptable. Judges will penalize debaters for such actions.

- **h)** The witness is not obliged to provide a yes or no answer. If it is necessary, she can qualify her answer.

- **i)** If a question contains more than one question, ask the questioner which of the several questions she wants answered.

- **j)** Judges are instructed to invoke heavy penalties for sarcasm, browbeating, discourtesy or other attempts to discredit an opponent.

- **k)** Never ask a question for which you have no notion of the answer.

- **l)** Learn how to shift from one question to another. Do not spend too much time on a question once it is apparent that you cannot obtain the answer you want.

### Rules of Cross-Examination

- **a)** The examiner shall control the cross-examination. The witness, however, shall be permitted reasonable time to answer a question.

- **b)** The witness has the right to qualify answers.

- **c)** The witness must answer all relevant questions.

- **d)** The witness shall not ask questions unless to request clarification.

- **e)** A debater shall not seek assistance from her colleague while asking or answering questions.

- **f)** Judges shall penalize speech-making on the part of the examiner, lack of co-operation by the witness, stalling, irrelevance, flippancy, discourtesy, browbeating, or any attempt to personally belittle or discredit an opponent.

- **g)** During the cross-examination, it is permissible to introduce new contentions and new evidence.

- **h)** A witness shall not take unnecessary time to answer a question.

- **i)** The examiner should ask fair questions on relevant subjects. Questions need not be directly related to the speech just delivered by the witness, although they should pertain ultimately to the issue at hand.

- **j)** During a cross-examination, examiners may only ask questions; accordingly they should be penalized for making speeches or rebutting at this time.

- **k)** The moderator shall not intervene when irrelevant remarks are made, unless they are in response to a pertinent question; in that case, either on request or on her own initiative, she shall order the witness to answer the question directly.
"Step by Step" Checklist for Parliamentary Style (Case line & Global Clash)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Minister Constructive Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hook your audience with a good introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Define terms of resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sign post: Label your three arguments and indicate how they will be divided between you and your partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Present your case line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Present, explain and prove your first two arguments (LEET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tie-back your case to your case line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Government Constructive Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sign post the order you intend to construct or deconstruct, and the last major argument you are going to make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Incorporate admissions from questions and deconstruct (clash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Put forth your final argument (LEET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advance the first two arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tie your case back to your case line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader of Opposition Constructive Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sign post the order you intend to construct or deconstruct, and the last major argument you are going to make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Incorporate admissions from cross-examination and deconstruct (clash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Put forth your final argument (LEET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advance the first two arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Opposition Constructive Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Argue Affirmative definitions of terms (if necessary). If you disagree with the definitions you must say so in your first speech. Otherwise the assumption is that you accept the definitions. You cannot first accept the definitions and later reject them! So there!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sign post your strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have the option of presenting your own constructive case first, or dealing with the deconstruction then moving on. Indicate how the constructive arguments will be divided between the partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Present your case line, incorporate any admissions, etc. made through questions, put forth the first two arguments of your constructive case (LEET) and deconstruct (clash) the previous speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last 3 minutes of the Leader of the Opposition’s Speech and the Prime Minister’s Reply speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Put the debate in perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distil the opponents’ case line, and put it in a negative light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Restate own case line including three major constructive points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attack the fundamental principle of an opponents’ case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rebuild the principle of your own case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conclude with case line and why it matters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Debaters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remember to use Questions, Heckles, Points of Order, Points of Personal Privilege, and parliamentary language (Madam or Mr. Speaker, my constituents, this House, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Step by Step" Checklist for National Style (Case line & Global Clash)

First Proposition Constructive Checklist
1. Define the terms
2. Establish the case line
4. Present two or three constructive arguments.
5. Make the team’s approach crystal clear.

Second Opposition Constructive Speech
1. Introduce one or two constructive arguments.
2. Clash with the new constructive matter presented by the second opposition.
3. Summarize the opposition case presented.
4. DO NOT engage in an overall summary / rebuttal of the debate.

First Opposition Constructive Speech
1. Must clash with the points just made by the first proposition
2. Advance the case line,
3. Advance the case division
4. Present the first two arguments of the opposition side.
(Constructive argumentation or refutation may be done first, and once again, the judges will consider the effectiveness of the strategy chosen.)

First Opposition Summary/Rebuttal
Followed by
First Proposition Summary/Rebuttal
1. Summarize the key themes or ideas that have taken place in the debate.
2. Put the debate in context and explain the ‘crux’, or the internal logic of both cases
3. Explain why, on this basis, your team has to win.
4. Examine and summarize the arguments presented,
5. Focus on the major areas of contention that evolved during the round.
6. Final opportunity for a team to convince the judge why their team has won the round.
7. No new information is to be presented in this speech.

Second Proposition Constructive Speech
1. Clash with the case presented by the first opposition speaker
2. Advance one or two more constructive arguments for the proposition.
3. Rebuild the proposition case.

All Debaters
Each debater should offer at least one POI per speaker and accept at least one POI from each speaker. The first and last minute of each speech is protected time. There are no POIs in the Rebuttal/Reply speeches.
Helpful Hints on POIs

• **Give two POIs, and take two POIs**
  - POIs shouldn't be given for the sole purpose of destroying the other team's case. POIs should build your case up as well.
  - If you're in the opening half of the debate your priority in the second half should be to remain involved. Make sure your arguments aren't lost among the second half of the debate. POIs are the best way to accomplish this.
  - If you're in the second half of the debate then you should be extremely careful about the POIs that you give to first half teams. Sometimes your opening team may try and steal your extension if you give too much away in your POIs. (refers to British Parliamentary style)
  - Try to remain involved in the debate by standing on POIs, but do not harass the speaker by continually standing on POIs and saying things like "On Liberty", "On the Geneva Convention", etc.
  - It is always better to get in one or two excellent POIs than four or five mediocre ones. One of the best ways to accomplish this is for you and your partner to put a sheet a paper between you with your best POI written down. Then, when the speaker takes either of you you're certain to have an excellent POI.
  - Just because everyone else is standing up on a POI doesn't mean you have to, Sometimes when a speaker says something monumentally stupid everyone on opposite benches will stand up. Usually the speaker won't take a POI at that time, but if there's someone who stood up late, they just might let them ask a question. Often, the debater giving the POI will be caught off-guard by this. So don't stand up on a POI just because everyone else is. But if you do, make sure you have a question.
  - Let people finish their question before you wave them down, but if they start to make a speech, or refuse to sit down, start waving them down immediately. If they still won't sit down then the speaker will deal with them.
  - Finish your thought before you accept a question. It is very easy to forget where you were if you allow someone to interrupt you.
  - If you want to get your question taken it is often better to stand at the end of the speaker's point. They'll be more likely to take you.
  - If you are in a round with teams of very disparate skills, it may at first seem like a good idea to take POIs from the weakest team. And that can work. But the judges will be more impressed if you give a good answer to a difficult POI than if you smack down a weak POI. So you might want to choose to take POIs from the better team. This will show the judges that you're willing to engage the better team in the round.

Adapted from the British Parliamentary guide found at www.csdf-fcde.ca/english/resources/University_BP_Guide.doc
"Step by Step" Checklist for World Style (Case line & Global Clash)
See the Complete Step Guide for detailed descriptions

**First Proposition Constructive Checklist**
1. Define the terms (always straight, no squirreling)
2. Establish the case line
3. Give the case division (who covers what points – normally the first speaker deals with arguments 1 and 2 while the second speaker covers the 3rd argument)
4. Must make the team’s approach crystal clear

**Second Proposition Constructive Speech**
1. Must allow only two minutes to clash with the points just made by the first proposition
2. Use six minutes to advance the case line, case division and the first two arguments of the opposition side
3. This is critical

**First Opposition Constructive Speech**
1. Use two to three minutes to summarize and rebuild the proposition’s case
2. Use five or six minutes to give the rebuttal.
3. This is critical

**Second Opposition Constructive Speech**
1. Use four minutes to clash
2. Use four minutes to finish the opposition case
3. This is critical

**Third Proposition Constructive Speech**
1. Use two minutes to summarize and rebuild the proposition’s case
2. Use six minutes to give the rebuttal.
3. This is critical

**Third Opposition Constructive Speech**
1. Use one minute to rebuild
2. Use seven minutes to rebut
3. This is critical

**Opposition Reply Speech**
(Speech given by 1st or 2nd Opposition)
1. The reply speech is distinct from the just-completed rebuttal.
2. Demonstrate an alteration in mood and power.
3. Put the debate in context.
4. Explain the ‘crux’, or the internal logic of both cases
5. Explain why, on this basis, the opposition has to win.

**Proposition Reply Speech**
(Speech given by 1st or 2nd Proposition)
1. This is the concluding speech in the debater.
2. Demonstrate an alteration in mood and power.
3. Put the debate in context.
4. Explain the ‘crux’, or the internal logic of both cases
5. Explain why, on this basis, the proposition has to win.

**All Debaters**
Each debater should offer at least one to two POI per speaker and accept at least one POI from each speaker. The first and last minute of each speech is protected time. There are no POIs in the Reply speeches.
Helpful Hints for Debaters

1. Communicate an attitude of confidence, without appearing snobbish. Be poised, friendly, courteous and assertive. Even in a heated clash, never stoop to sarcasm or shouting. Be sincerely aroused, but keep in control. Have a good command of the language; a good vocabulary is important, but make sure you can understand and properly pronounce the words you use. Though you can refer to some notes, don’t ever read your speech.

2. When you speak, rise and stand in a comfortable spot on your side of the room, or in front of a podium if one is provided. Maintain an alert posture; avoid leaning on a table or desk and keep your hands out of your pockets and belt loops. Never cross in front or behind the speaker and/or moderator or the opposing team.

3. Maintain self-control; be firm but flexible, exhibit no anger though be unafraid to stand up to face your opponents vigorously and forcefully. Retain a sense of humour without trying to be a comedian.

4. Don’t do anything that will distract you or the judges, such as playing with your hair, jewellery, etc. Never wear a hat during a debate (unless it’s for religious custom). Look “presentable” as you are trying to impress the judges.

5. If you get flustered, stop, compose yourself, take a deep breath and start your sentence over again. Avoid nervous giggling by taking a deep breath as well. When in doubt about what you are doing, repeat the resolution or resume what you have said. Don’t have “dead space” in your delivery, causing the judges to wait and wonder if you have anything else to say. If you are finished, then repeat the resolution to conclude your speech and sit down.

6. Avoid using words and phrases such as: “um,” “OK”, “you know”, “like, uh”, “etceteras”, “and so forth”, “and lots more.” If you think there are more reasons, state them; do not use vague statements. And don’t read your speech.

7. Though you will be addressing the speaker, maintain eye contact with the judges when you speak, NOT the opposition. Remember not only are you unable to convince your opponents, you don’t even want to – it’s the judges who are marking you, convince them.

8. Don’t be afraid to heckle a bit during a parliamentary debate. Keep it short, tactful and preferably humourous. Don’t get distracted or flustered if you are heckled. Continue your speech and ignore the heckle. NEVER respond to your opposition’s heckles or questions; in fact, don’t ever acknowledge them during your speech.

9. Always remember that you and your partner are a team, and must support each other. Refer to each other’s remarks. Don’t talk or whisper to each other during an opponent’s speech. If it is necessary, discreetly pass notes.

10. Never admit that you are wrong about something (unless you misspoke yourself) that would contradict your standpoint. By seeming uncertain, judges will doubt your credibility and penalize you.

11. Don’t worry about pointing out the blatantly obvious. No matter how silly it may seem to you, the judges may not have realized or even considered it. This could score you an extra point or two, but it could also not hurt you.

12. Be organized. Know what you want to say, how you want to say it and in what order you want to say it. Don’t shuffle papers around looking for a particular item to discuss. For fewer papers, write points (not sentences) on small index cards. Take notes during all speeches by your opponents to help you in developing your rebuttal and cross-examination questions.

13. After a debate is over, teams traditionally rise, meet in the centre and shake hands with their opponents.

~ Adapted from the paper by Doug Clarke for Alberta Debate and Speech Association, on the CSDF web site
# British Parliamentary Debate

## Objective

To acquaint the debater with those procedures and terms unique to the British Parliamentary format of debate.

This section covers the purpose of each speaker, and stylistic conventions specific to the British Parliamentary format: four teams, POIs, and knifing.

## Instructor

Each debater in British Parliamentary style has very specific duties to fulfill, but the debate basics of case construction, deconstruction and summary/reply still apply.

SEDA Constitution and Policy Manual does not yet have detailed rules on British Parliamentary debate.

## INTRODUCTION

### How the Round Runs

There are four teams of two in a British Parliamentary round, the 1st proposition (prime minister and deputy prime minister), 1st opposition (leader of opposition and deputy leader of opposition), 2nd proposition (member of government and government whip), and 2nd opposition (member of opposition and opposition whip).

Each team must support the other team on their side (i.e. 2P cannot contradict 1P) while distinguishing itself as the best team on that side, while deconstructing arguments from the other side (the opposition teams).

The teams speak in order (1P/1O/2P/2O) with the front half teams setting up the debate, and the back half teams ‘extending’ and summarizing the debate.

Each speech is 5 or 7 minutes long.

### Complexity of the Round

With four teams instead of two, the round becomes much more complicated and much more difficult to judge.

You’ll notice that a lot of the speakers have some sort of summary role within their speech: this is necessary to help simplify the inherently complex round.

Each team usually tries to identify itself with some broad theme to help them stick out among all the other things in the judges’ minds.

Judges will rank teams from 1 to 4, so there are 24 different outcomes for each round instead of the 2 outcomes for each round in CP.

Therefore, judges often look for easy ways to make their decisions, which means there are some things you should avoid.

### Ways to Lose

‘Knifing’ (contradicting) your corresponding front-half team as a back half team is often considered an
automatic loss. You can’t disagree with them or change their case significantly.

Setting up a messy debate or over-interpreting the resolution as the 1P team will often cause you to lose, so make sure your case/model is clear, and the debate you want to have is understood by each other team.

Introducing no extension or a poor/irrelevant extension as a back half team will give judges good reason to drop you. A good extension introduces new arguments, shifts the focus of the debate, examines new case studies, or significantly develops a previously underdeveloped point.

**How to Win**

Unlike in CP debate, it isn’t enough to just have the best arguments in the round (although it is very important), you also have to fulfill your role as a team.

1P should be able to set up a good debate, defeat the 1O team in argumentation, restrict the 2P team by covering all the relevant arguments, and stay in the round with good arguments and POIs.

1O should defeat the 1P team in argumentation, restrict the 2O team by covering all the relevant arguments, and stay in the round with good arguments and POIs.

2P should defeat the 2O (and 1O) team in argumentation, present an extension that is stronger and more interesting than 1P’s case, be active (through POIs) early in the round, and summarize the round in prop’s favor (but 2P specifically).

2O should defeat the 2P (and 1P) team in argumentation, present an extension that is stronger and more interesting than 1O’s case, be active (through POIs) early in the round, and summarize the round in opp’s favor (but 2O specifically).

Most often, the teams that best meet their position’s specific criteria do better in the round and are ranked higher.

**Other**

POIs are allowed, just like in National style. The first and last minute of each speech are protected from POIs, and you can only ask POIs to teams on the other side of the house (i.e. 2P cannot ask questions to 1P).

You can always refuse POIs when speaking, but it is generally expected that you will accept two during your speech, and you should try to be strategic in who you accept POIs from.

HECKLING is NEVER allowed… you’ll have to restrict yourself to non-verbal interjections (head shaking, expressions, quiet outrage, silent laughing, etc.).

Although specific knowledge is not allowed in CP rounds, not only is it allowed in BP rounds, but it is required in order to do well.

You can bring magazines, binders, notes, etc. with you to a tournament and quote them in the rounds, although a good understanding of world issues should be adequate for regional-level debates.

**Preparing for a Round**

In British Parliamentary, all of the teams in the round are given a straightforward topic 15 minutes before the round begins (e.g. THW ban cosmetic surgery).

Every team can prepare during this time, since they all know what the round will be about (unlike university Canadian Parliamentary, where only the government knows the topic for debate).

Resolutions cannot be ‘squirreled’ or interpreted in any way, they must be debated as presented, although the PM may impose a specific model for the resolution.

The front half teams can plan on using any arguments they prepare, but the back half teams will have to develop many lines of argumentation (since they can’t repeat the front half teams) and then pick the best one during the round.

**Resources**

Thank you to the University of Saskatchewan Debate Society for the information provided in this unit:

http://homepage.usask.ca/~ss_usdbs/module4.doc

Other resources on the internet can be found at:

www.albertadebate.com/adebate/resources/styles/bparl.pdf

www.albertadebate.com/adebate/resources/debate/Advanced_BP.ppt


http://cusid.ca/documents/guides/BPGuide.doc
"Step by Step" Checklist for British Parliamentary Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Minister – 1st Proposition team (1P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explain status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Define case/model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Construct arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader of the Opposition – 1st Opposition team (1O)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Challenge definitions if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Construct arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deconstruct Prime Minister’s arguments and case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deputy Prime Minister – 1st Proposition team (1P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Construct rest of arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deconstruct Leader of the Opposition’s arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1st half ‘rebuttal’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deputy Leader of the Opposition – 1st Opposition team (1O)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Construct arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deconstruct Deputy Prime Minister’s arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1st half ‘rebuttal’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister of the Government – 2nd Proposition team (2P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summarize 1st half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deconstruct Deputy Leader of the Opposition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister of the Opposition – 2nd Opposition team (2O)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sum 1st half + Minister of the Government’s arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deconstruct Minister of the Government’s arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Whip – 2nd Proposition team (2P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deconstruct Minister of the Opposition’s arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summarize round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do not provide constructive arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposition Whip – 2nd Opposition team (2O)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deconstruct Government Whip’s presentation of the round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summarize round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do not provide constructive arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEDA's Fair Play Code for Debaters

Debaters:

1. I will participate because I want to, not just because others expect me to.
2. I will follow the rules, and act in the spirit of debate.
3. I will control my temper - arguing and inappropriate conduct can spoil the activity for everyone.
4. I will respect my opponents.
5. I will do my best to be a true team player.
6. I will remember that winning isn't everything - that having fun, improving skills, making friends and doing my best are also important.
7. I will acknowledge all good performances - those of my partner and of my opponents.
8. I will remember that coaches and judges are there to help me. I will accept their decisions and show them respect and appreciation.
9. I will raise issues diplomatically and appropriately.

At SEDA, we value debaters who truly listen to each other and who respect their teammates, their opponents, their coaches, the judges and the audience.

Remember, just because a style like National Style may seem casual, it doesn’t mean you can be disrespectful.

Address your opponents with courtesy and allow them a chance to express themselves by not asking too many POIs.