

To Staff:

Greetings, and welcome to the WDI 2004 staff-produced booklet of lesson plans and activities. This is designed to make your job easier. If we can make your job easier in any way, please let me know. A few things you should know about the lesson plan booklet:

- 1. It is not exclusive. There are many more activities and such available directly from me – please ask!**
- 2. We will help you copy the appropriate number of handouts if you need help, but this should help you be able to photocopy handouts on your own in the copiers at RTT. Please let me know if you need any additional help.**

I have listed the author of each lesson only so that you can ask the author for help interpreting or fleshing out their ideas.

Please consider taking some time to coordinate with others teaching your same segment to share ideas and such. In addition, if you produce any additional documents, please share them with me so I can share them with other staff members.

**Thanks for all your hard work,
Kate**

INDEX

Lesson	Level	Author	Handouts?	Page Numbers
Cross-examination on critiques	Basic & Adv	Massey	Yes	2-4
Using Prep Time	Basic & Adv	Miller	Yes	5-9
Build A T Argument	Basic & Adv	Lee	Yes	10-13
Basic Critiques	Basic	Morgan-Parmett	Yes	14-19
Advanced Critiques	Advanced	Morgan-Parmett	Yes	20-25
Extending & Answering Disads	Basic	Llano	Yes	26-32
Flowing	Basic & Review for all	Marty	Yes	33-39
Negative Strategy	Basic & Adv	Green	Yes	40-43
Aff Constructives	Basic & Adv	Shuster	Yes	44-47
Basic Counterplans	Basic	Shuster	Yes	48-51
Refutation	Basic	Shuster	Yes	52-55
Understanding Evidence	Basic	Shuster	Yes	56-57
What makes a source qualified?	Basic	Shuster	Yes	58-59
Exercises for reinforcing argumentation & reasoning skills	Basic & Adv.	Shuster	Yes	60-64
Counterplans & competition practicum	Basic & Adv	Meany	Yes	65-81
Answering Topicality	Advanced	Atwood	Yes	82-88

BASIC LEVEL - Cross-Examining the defender of the “Kritik”!

I - What is your strategy?

II - What will be the key arguments in the debate?

III - Don’t show your hand if you don’t have to!

IV - Don’t confuse the judge about your arguments!

I. What is your strategy?

Strategy A - If you link --

Impact debate

Permutation debate

Strategy B - If you do not link ---

Link turn debate

Permutation debate

II. What will be the key arguments in the debate?

*If strategy A -- you know you are going to link.

a. Explore how the affirmative plans to win the debate with the criticism and why? Who are the key authors? Where is this evidence? What happens if you link a little bit vs. linking a lot?

b. Does the criticism claim that every time X should happen, a debate should be lost? What is the language in the evidence that makes this argument? Would this author support the use of punishment as a way to solve?

*If strategy B -- You think you turn or capture the kritik.

a. Explore the link debate to see if your argument can link turn their argument. Does the link evidence not assume what position your argument makes? Can you interpret the link evidence to support your argument?

b. Explore the permutation debate to see prove your argument is not in exclusive disagreement with their impact evidence. Do the impact authors disagree with the concept behind your affirmative? Would their author support punishment? How does the author claim we should address the problem? Does the alternative include a world different than the world created by the affirmative?

III. Don’t show your hand if you don’t have to! Don’t highlight correctable mistakes.

Remember that the negative still has another constructive speech. For example, watch out for:

a. Link example -- 2nc still gets to read link evidence

b. missed affirmative evidence - 2nc can still attack affirmative evidence

IV - Don’t create confusion about your arguments --

*Don’t make arguments in cx -- look for offense against their arguments through questions.

*Lead the witness -- ask pointed questions, and don’t allow the other team to ramble.

DRILLS TO PREPARE FOR CROSS-EXAMING KRITIKS

Scenario #1 -- Round #1 You are affirmative and arguing in favor of sending peacekeeping forces to Haiti. The negative argues a kritik with this structure:

- A. Affirmative plan offers a view of Africa as being dark and scary, creates perception of the dark continent.*
- B. Concept of the dark continent is used to perpetuate racism in foreign policy.*
- C. Must always reject racism ---- do not accept racist foreign policies.*

What do you do?

Scenario #2 - Round #2

You are affirmative and arguing in favor of sending peacekeeping forces to Haiti. The negative argues a kritik with this structure:

- A. Democracy promotion in Africa perpetuates the creation of more violent dictators.*
- B. Democracy promotion is a flawed concept and must be rejected.*

What do you do?

Scenario #3 - Round #3

You are affirmative and arguing in favor of sending peacekeeping forces to Haiti. The negative argues a kritik with this structure:

- A. Affirmative policy is a tool of the development agenda.*
- B. The development agenda must be rejected, as it perpetuates global inequalities and is racist in nature.*

What do you do?

ADVANCED LEVEL - Cross-Examining the defender of the “Kritik”!

I - What is your strategy?

II - What will be the key arguments in the debate?

III - Don't show your hand if you don't have to!

IV - Make the CX effective, not just prep-time

V - You need to know!

I. What is your strategy?

Strategy A - If you link -- Impact debate & Permutation debate

Strategy B - If you do not link --- Link turn debate & Permutation debate

II. What will be the key arguments in the debate?

*If strategy A -- you know you are going to link.

a. Explore how the affirmative plans to win the debate with the criticism and why?

Who are the key authors? Where is this evidence? What happens if you link a little bit vs. linking a lot?

b. Does the criticism claim that every time X should happen, a debate should be lost? What is the language in the evidence that makes this argument? Would this author support the use of punishment as a way to solve?

*If strategy B -- You think you turn or capture the kritik.

a. Explore the link debate to see if your argument can link turn their argument. Does the link evidence not assume what position your argument makes? Can you interpret the link evidence to support your argument?

b. Explore the permutation debate to see prove your argument is not in exclusive disagreement with their impact evidence. Do the impact authors disagree with the concept behind your affirmative? Would their author support punishment? How does the author claim we should address the problem? Does the alternative include a world different than the world created by the affirmative?

III - Don't show your hand if you don't have to! Don't highlight correctable mistakes!

a. Link example -- 2nc still gets to read link evidence

b. missed affirmative evidence - 2nc can still attack affirmative evidence

IV - Make the CX effective, not just prep time

a. Don't ask open ended questions, be specific

b. Make them prove their evidence says what they wish. - especially when their evidence uses vague and subjective terms. What does it mean to reject?

c. Don't get lazy and allow them to re-read their best evidence.

d. Don't ask questions that confirm the obvious.

e. Make sure your flow is adequate if you run out of questions.

V - You need to know!

a. Make sure you know what the kritik is saying, and have a clear grasp of their argument. IE many types of statism

b. Know the key authors they will be going for -- 1ar should make specific indicts

- c. Why do you link? -- seek out the specific evidence that proves this -- either generically or specifically.

Prep Time Small Group

Advanced Group (*Beginning Group material in Italics*)

Lecture/Discussion Handout

- I. What is Preparation Time?
- II.. How long is Preparation Time?
- III. What do you do during your preparation time?
- IV. How do you practice preparation time strategies?

I. What is Preparation Time?

(have a discussion, ask the students their views or questions about prep)

- a. *The time you have during the week before the tournament.*
- b. *. The time between rounds at a tournament.*
- c. *The time between speeches.*

II.. How long is Preparation Time?

(Use your own judgment, these are just some of my ideas. I want them to have some expectations about times, help them learn to schedule and manage time and work)

- a. *don't overdo it. Plan on 4-5 hours a week. A little less time than you spend on homework. About an hour a day.*
- b. *Times between rounds will vary, some follow immediately sometimes you can have up to an hour.*
- c. *In most debates you will have eight minutes total time that you can divide up any way before your speeches.*

III. What do you do during your preparation time? (During the Week)

ACTIVITY 1

III. What do you do during your preparation time? (During the Tournament)

III. What do you do during your preparation time? (During the Round)

ACTIVITY 2

- a. *in general*
 - 1. *make sure you have written down all the other teams arguments*
 - 2. *make sure you understand all of the arguments. What are their claims? What sort of evidence do they use to support these claims?*
 - 3. *think of 3 answers to each major argument.*
- b. *when affirmative*
 - 1. *1AC-first affirmative constructive*
 - i. *all prep before the debate*
 - ii. *with your partner develop a set of answers to anticipated cross examination questions*
 - 2. *2AC-second affirmative constructive*
 - 3. *1AR-first affirmative constructive*
 - 4. *2AR-second affirmative constructive*
- c. *when negative*
 - 1. *1NC-First negative constructive*

2. 2NC *Second negative constructive*
3. 1NR *First negative rebuttal*
4. 2NR *Second negative rebuttal*

Activity #1

Pre-round Prep About 15 minute activity

Set up. Either have 5 pages of a file or have each student bring their own

1. Take a file and highlight the evidence, write extension statements for the cards.
2. I suggest they all work on a file of their choice. Set aside about ten minutes to highlight and write summaries for a couple of briefs. Then take 5 minutes having students read their summaries and discuss highlighting
3. This activity helps explain what preparing for the tournament means.

Activity #2

In round Prep. About 20 minute activity

Setup: Need the pre-made 1nc and 2AC that I will include once I have access to all files

You will need copies for every other person, so that each team can have the evidence

1. Have students partner up and form teams. Give them 3 minutes to prepare answers to the 1nc. I suggest having the instructor act as the 1N and answer cross examination questions for 2 minutes first. .

This means half the students are prepping, 1/2 ask questions. Then they help there partner prep.

2. Have everyone discuss the answers made and then do the same thing with the other teammate on the pre-made 2AC

3. Have everyone take notes on what answers were made, what techniques others used and work to do ahead of time to make better use of prep time

Prep Time Small Group

Student Hand Out

- I. What is Preparation Time?
- II. How long is Preparation Time?
- III. What do you do during your preparation time?

I. What is Preparation Time?

- d. The time you have during the week before the tournament.
- e. The time between rounds at a tournament.
- f. The time between speeches.

II. How long is Preparation Time?

- d. Don't overdo it. Plan on 4-5 hours a week. A little less time than you spend on homework. About an hour a day.
- e. Times between rounds will vary; some follow immediately sometimes you can have up to an hour.
- f. In most debates you will have eight minutes total time that you can divide up any way before your speeches.
- g. Each tournament can specify the amount of prep time they offer.

III. What do you do during your preparation time? (During the Week)

- a. Read and highlight your evidence. Knowing where and what all your evidence proves is the best way to be prepared for a debate.
- b. Go over your flows
 - i. Look for arguments you heard to do front lines for
 - ii. Think of arguments you should/could have made.
 - iii. Look for arguments you would like to research
- c. Develop and fine tune strategies versus other affs and negs
- d. Try to read and understand other teams authors/evidence.

III. What do you do during your preparation time? (During the Tournament)

- a. Have a place to work
 - i. Sometimes a main gathering room, sometimes in the room where your last debate. Sometimes an area your team has secured
 - ii. Meet with your partner and coach at this place.
- b. Talk about what arguments are new at the tournament and think of answers.
- c. Redo your rebuttals (even without your coach)
- d. Talk to your teammates about what other schools are saying about your gown's schools' arguments and evidence

III. What do you do during your preparation time? (During the Round)

- d. In general
 - 1. make sure you have written down all the other teams arguments

2. Make sure you understand all of the arguments. What are their claims? What sort of evidence do they use to support these claims?
 3. Think of 3 answers to each major argument.
- e. When affirmative
1. 1AC-first affirmative constructive
 - i. All prep before the debate
 - ii. With your partner develop a set of answers to anticipated Cross examination questions
 2. 2AC-second affirmative constructive
 - i. Try to use as much of the cross ex time prepping not listening. Only listen to the beginning, have your partner tell you of any key answers/concessions the other team makes
 - ii. Frontlines-hopefully you have some, check to make sure they answers the argument that was actually made not the one you think you heard
 - iii. Have your partner read their evidence and help write frontlines for arguments you don't have.
 3. 1AR-first affirmative constructive.
 - i. Prep answers to the 2nc during your partner's cross-examination of the 2N.
 - ii. Use actual prep time only to answer 1NR arguments
 - iii. Have partner decide what evidence you should read.
 - iv. Know what arguments the 2AC want extended. This should be discussed before and during the round.
 4. 2AR-second affirmative constructive
 - i. Have your partner write a short overview while you read all the evidence the 2NR focused on.
 - ii. Use this time to really draw out the differences between your argument and their argument.
 - iii. Practice the overview (out in the hallway if necessary). Keep it short and direct the judge to your winning arguments and evidence.
- f. When negative
1. 1NC-First negative constructive
 - i. You shouldn't really need to take prep time
 - ii. If the aff is completely new to you, look for any evidence you have either specific link or case cards.
 - iii. After partner finishes cross-ex talk about what you have found and what she got out of cx and pick which off case and best negative case evidence you will run. If they are generic or nonspecific, use this time to show how their own evidence puts them in the generic categories your evidence talks about.
 2. 2NC Second negative constructive
 - i. First, divide up arguments with your partner. DON'T PREP THE SAME ARGUMENTS, split up the work.
 - ii. Once you divided up the block, both start prepping separate arguments.

- iii. Leave the argument that requires the most in depth evidence comparison (critique, counter plan competition) for the 1NR. This will save you prep time.
 - iv. Use prep to decide which evidence you need to read (you should read a lot for the 2NC) and how it answers the 2AC arguments.
 - v. Prep everything you plan on taking so that if you do run out of time you can give 1NR prepped out arguments in stead of taking prep time for the 1NR
3. 1NR First negative rebuttal
- i. NEVER TAKE PREP TIME – you have 2NC prep + 2NC speech+2NC co to get ready that’s at least 11 minutes.
 - ii. Take prep if your partner asks you to finish some 2NC argument
 - iii. Take prep if you need partners advice on strategy or evidence
4. 2NR Second negative rebuttal
- i. Have your partner write the overview while you read evidence
 - ii. Decide a strategy early, than make sure to concede out of some arguments to play defense, and compare evidence on the arguments you are planning to win the debate on.
 - iii. Leave yourself time to play “what would I say” with your partner. Figure out what the 2AR will say to your strategy and make sure to pre-empt them.

WDI 2k4

Building a T argument

OHHHHHHH Topicality! Many hate it, few understand it, and even fewer can form a Topicality shell and argument that is capable of winning them the debate round.

First, a short list of purposes that Topicality can serve

--Well it's horrible and unfashionable to say, but often times Topicality can be your strategy against a case to which you have nothing to say. It's very likely that your difficulty strategizing against a case can be a product of its unfairness!

--Even if you're not so much about the whole "going for T in the 2nr thing" topicality can be the most effective tool in garnering a link to an argument that actually do want to go for. For Example, let's say that you have a killer link to a spending disadvantage, but you're not absolutely positive that the affirmative is going to spend any money with their Cambodia De-mining Affirmative...what do you do? Well a pretty savvy thing to do would be to lay down the "reverse pit of doom" by interpreting the word support to mean monetary assistance...unless they say that they're not topical...well then they link!

The importance of formulating a good T argument thus, begins with knowing what you want to get out of it. That may sound rather simple, but it's the reason that the best topicality arguments are not pre-canned junk that you pull out of your tub for every round. This is the beginning of writing a topicality argument; it's like a logic game in which you make words serve your purpose!

WDI 2k4

Building a T argument

So as a group let's do some dissection and ask the right questions, alright here's the situation...The Affirmative's plan is that...The United States Federal Government should establish a Foreign Policy Substantially Increasing its support of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations by providing military and technical assistance to resolve the secession dispute between Quebec and the Republic of Canada.

Sounds kind of funny...I mean it sounds not-Topical, but...what's wrong with it?

...a moment of pause is always a good thing...often times Plan Texts just feel wrong, so you jump into your topicality file, find a definition, plug in some standards, and slap a voter on the end...BAD APPROACH!!!

Question #1—What arguments that you would normally run are taken away by this affirmative? In this instance this question seems a little strange, they still support UN peacekeeping, so theoretically all of your peacekeeping arguments should apply...but...hold on, there's absolutely nothing out there that talks about UN peacekeeping in reference to Quebec...that doesn't seem fair!!!

Question #2—What word in the resolution does this infraction seemed based on? Well here is where we stumble into the biggest misunderstanding of most Topicality debates; the A. subpoint definition is not arbitrary. It's one of the most important decisions you can make. It's more about your interpretation of a phrase than just a definition of a word. We want to stop them from being able to get out of our generic peacekeeping arguments, so here's the logical train of thought. They don't link to any literature about peacekeeping, because plan doesn't have the US federal government provide support for a currently existing peacekeeping measure. Now we return to the original question...which word? Well it's Increase! Our interpretation could be that increase means "That which is added to the original stock by augmentation or growth; produce; profit; interest." From dictionary.com, implying that there must be an original stock. And Since the UN doesn't currently do peacekeeping towards Canada, the original stock doesn't exist

Question #3(the most important)—Why is this better for debate? This is how you win Topicality debates! Topicality is about competing interpretations of the resolution, whichever one is best for debate wins!!! This is what people refer to as standards. I can think of 3 reasons off the top of my head why this is a better interpretation for debate. First, what people call predictable ground, it's the reason the interpretation that would call the Quebec AFF topical is not fair...because it takes away the core predictable ground of peacekeeping literature away from the negative. Second, Our interpretation of increase creates a fair limit to the topic...it's not too small, there are 13 currently existing peacekeeping operations allowing the affirmative PLENTY of room to create a case. While an interpretation that would allow for Quebec would allow ANY new peacekeeping operation, which is essentially LIMITLESS, allowing the Affirmative to do basically anything, which the negative could never prepare for. Third, it's the clearest briteline for an interpretation. A list of 13 operations exists on the UN website, it's the most objective standard of what is and isn't topical that could be created!

Question #4—Why does this mean that the Affirmative Loses? This is one of the more difficult questions to answer. But it really boils down to two things, and they are what debate is about Education and Fairness. Debate is about how we can learn the most, and if the Affirmative is allowed to do something that doesn't allow the Negative an opportunity to fairly compete, then there's no real progress to the conversation, and no one learns anything, so we might as well go play poker. So what you're not in debate to learn, you're here to win! Well a world in which the Affirmative can do whatever they want ensures that there wouldn't be fair competition, the Affirmative would win every debate, which means everyone would have the same record...yippee! That would be awful; it would destroy the reason to debate.

These Questions are essential in the formation of a T argument...let's review just to see what a topicality violation would look like

A. Interpretation

Increase—"That which is added to the original stock by augmentation or growth; produce; profit; interest." From dictionary.com,

B. Violation

The Affirmative increases support for Peacekeeping towards Canada, Increase implies an "existing stock" and since the UN doesn't currently do peacekeeping operations in Canada, they would be creating rather than increasing

C. Standards or Reasons to Prefer

1. Predictable Ground-They take away all of the generic literature on peacekeeping, given that there is absolutely no peacekeeping operation(s) in Canada
2. Limits- They allow the Affirmative to do any new peacekeeping operation, thus making the topic infinitely skewed towards the affirmative. We don't overlimit allowing them variations on 13 currently existing peacekeeping operations
3. Briteline-We reduce the guesswork, its thirteen cases that a simple list can prove. This is the best way to decide what is and isn't topical

D. Topicality is a voting issue, for reasons of fairness and education

WDI 2k4
Building a T argument

So you have the questions to ask and the skills with which to Build a T argument...let's put you to the test!

Break up into 4 groups...here's some fatally jacked plan texts...Gimme a T argument

Resolved: That the United States federal government should establish a foreign policy substantially increasing its support of Tie-Dyed Peace Symbol shirts to Haiti, funding and enforcement guaranteed

Resolved: That United States Trade Representative Robert Zoellick should establish a foreign policy substantially increasing subsidies on the sale of Yo-Yo's to all nations that currently housing UN peacekeeping operations

Resolved: That the United States federal government should establish a foreign policy substantially increasing its support of United Nations peacekeeping operations by withdrawing from the United Nations security council

Resolved: That the United States federal government should establish a foreign policy substantially increasing its support of United Nations peacekeeping operations by providing all relevant technical and military assistance to Eritrea, funding and enforcement guaranteed

HAVE FUN!

BASIC KRITIK

I. WHAT ARE ASSUMPTIONS? DISCUSSION

- A. **assumptions are--something that is believed to be true without proof or is taken for granted to be true;** it is to take something as the starting point of an argument or a reason for action rather than given as a reason for why you are making that argument or taking that action
- **for example**—in justifying why **school** is good and necessary, it is assumed that you all want to be good workers and grow up and get a good job some day
- **for example**—WDI gives you a **curfew** because it is assumed that as teenagers, you will be getting into trouble at night...their assumption about what kind of person a teenager is the starting point for their argument that is taken for granted to be true without necessarily providing proof that any of you as individuals are going to do anything bad, but you are still made to have a curfew
- B. Why are assumptions bad?
1. they make an ass- out of “u” and “me”
 2. they make generalizations or stereotypes without real knowledge about individual cases
 3. they justify actions without looking at all possible consequences, or ignore known consequences
 - a. for example—civilian casualties that might be incurred through peacekeeping operations are ignored because it is assumed that they are justified by the overall end that they will achieve
 4. they justify the ends without looking at the means

Now, what are some assumptions that are made in the topic and this year's resolutions?

II. COMMON KRITIKS FOR THE TOPIC

A. DISCUSS THE RESOLUTION AND WHAT ASSUMPTIONS ARE MADE IN THE WORDS IN THE RESOLUTION

1. What does “The USFG should establish a foreign policy” assume in the context of the resolution?
 - a. the state is good, the US is a good actor, and can do things, politics is good
 - b. other people besides for individuals should act
 - c. people outside of the US can't solve problems w/o the US
 - d. assumes action is good, nihilism and inaction is bad
2. What does “substantially increasing its support of United Nations” assume?
 - a. The UN is an independent entity that has some level of sovereignty, that it is a separate entity from the US, ignores US control over UN
 - b. B, c, and d from above also apply—gives power to a governing body
3. What does “peacekeeping operations” assume?

- a. peace can be kept
- b. peace is good or desirable
- c. peace is the absence of violence committed by the other, we fight in peace, but “they” fight in aggression
--talk about Bosnia and Kosovo as examples, Hutus and Tutsis, Jews and Palestinians

B. OTHER KRITIKS THAT ARE RELEVANT FOR THIS TOPIC
(ESPECIALLY FOCUS ON KRITIKS THAT THEY WILL HAVE IN THEIR EVIDENCE SET)

1. democracy promotion
2. statism
3. capitalism
4. “peace”

Now that you have some idea about what kritikis are and how they function in relation to this year’s resolution, how do you put together or structure a kritik in a debate?

III. PARTS OF A KRITIK

A. **LINK**—what does the affirmative *assume*? What do they believe is good or true about the world in order to believe that their plan is a good idea or that their arguments are valid? What do they say or what action do they take that makes problematic assumptions?

****for example**—the United States assumes that peacekeeping is a good means of promoting democracy abroad and that this promotion of democracy makes the world and that country a better place.

B. **IMPACT**—why are these assumptions bad? What problems do they lead to? What happens if we allow the assumptions to be made in this specific instance? What are the negative consequences of making these assumptions and/or acting on them through the affirmative?

****for example**—promoting democracy is a mask for the extension of the United States domination of the world in which millions of people get exploited everyday and are driven into poverty, starvation, and death

C. **ALTERNATIVE**—how else can we solve the problems that the affirmative is discussing without falling victim to the negative consequences outlined in the kritik? What ways do you propose we can solve the problems that the kritik discusses?

****for example**—the alternative to promoting democracy is to allow countries to have self determination, which means that each country should be allowed to decide how they want to govern themselves

IV. ACTIVITY—FINDING ASSUMPTIONS IN A PIECE OF EVIDENCE

--split up into groups of 2 and give each group a piece of evidence (something from the pre-camp packet)

--one person will present the arguments that are made in the evidence

--second person will present the assumptions that are made in that evidence (both people work together in coming with both the arguments and the assumptions)

- V. DISTRIBUTE HANDOUT ON “PARTS OF A KRITIK” AND BRIEFLY GO OVER IF THERE IS TIME...SOME OF THE HANDOUT MAY BE BEYOND WHAT THEY KNOW ABOUT DEBATE AS OF YET, BUT AS THEY LEARN MORE, THEY CAN CONTINUE TO USE IT AS A REFERENCE AND ALSO ASK THEIR COACHES AND OTHER FACULTY MEMBERS TO EXPLAIN TERMS AND CONCEPTS THEY DO NOT UNDERSTAND

parts of kritiks handout

PARTS OF A KRITIK

*LINK—what does the affirmative *assume*? What do they believe is good or true about the world in order to believe that their plan is a good idea or that their arguments are valid? What do they say or what action do they take that makes problematic assumptions?

**for example—the United States assumes that peacekeeping is a good means of promoting democracy abroad and that this promotion of democracy makes the world and that country a better place.

*IMPACT—why are these assumptions bad? What problems do they lead to? What happens if we allow the assumptions to be made in this specific instance? What are the negative consequences of making these assumptions and/or acting on them through the affirmative?

**for example—promoting democracy is a mask for the extension of the United States domination of the world in which millions of people get exploited everyday and are driven into poverty, starvation, and death

*ALTERNATIVE—how else can we solve the problems that the affirmative is discussing without falling victim to the negative consequences outlined in the kritik? What ways do you propose we can solve the problems that the kritik discusses?

**for example—the alternative to promoting democracy is to allow countries to have self determination, which means that each country should be allowed to decide how they want to govern themselves

TIPS FOR WINNING ON THE KRITIK

1. Have a 2NC overview if your kritik is complicated or needs explaining to the judge
2. don't spend all your time on the link and forget the implication and the alternative, the opposite is also true, but generally, you'll win the link easier than the impact or alternative
3. make sure your alternative competes with the affirmative's case—how does your alternative solve for the case?
4. Make sure you explain how the affirmative makes the problems outlined in the critique worse
5. Win a case turn, then the alternative becomes less important
6. Write 2NC/1NR blocks to key arguments
 - perms
 - likely link turns
 - non-unique
 - link and impact extensions
 - answer to no alternative
7. Group 2AC answers that are similar
8. Don't go for everything in the 2NR—you only need to win one link and one key permutation answer
9. Read evidence against the perm, it can even be generic permutation evidence, but specific perm evidence for your kritik is best
10. BE SPECIFIC! For example, don't just talk about capitalism in general, explain specifically what parts of the plan use capitalist means and how, explain specifically how the bad parts of capitalism will pop up in the implementation of their plan

Types of kritiks handout

Language kritik—criticizes the particular language used by a team

**for example: “terrorist/terrorism” K, using the word terrorist automatically implies negative assumptions about Arabs and Muslims

Discourse kritik—criticizes not just the language you use like your word is bad, but instead criticizes the way teams construct your arguments and justifications for action

**for example: development K, speaking about other nations as underdeveloped, backwards, and in need of other people to solve their problems for them as justifications for sending in peacekeeping operations

Method kritik—criticizes the means that the affirmative uses to solve

**for example: militarism K, using violent means to achieve peace

**for example: the kritik of debate, using traditional forms of debate like line by line and speed

Epistemology kritik—criticizes the assumptions of the affirmative’s basis for knowing what is and what is not true

**for example: realism K, assuming that politics happens on the level of states that act in their own interests

Ontology kritik—criticizes the affirmative’s basis for understanding what it means to be a being in the world

**for example: biopolitics K, peacekeeping is a way for the government to promote life which allows the government to determine for us what it means to be alive

Ideology kritik—criticizes the affirmative’s assumptions about what is valuable or good

**for example: capitalism K, assuming that economic growth is inherently good and necessary

ADVANCED KRITIK LECTURE

I. REVIEW DISCUSSION—ASK STUDENTS QUESTIONS AND HAVE THEM RESPOND, WRITE ON BOARD

- A. What is a kritik?
 1. criticizes assumptions of the affirmative
 2. points out problems in what aff says and/or does that prove they have problematic assumptions or justifications for their actions
- B. What are the different parts of a kritik and how do they function? (see handout)
 1. LINK
 2. INTERNAL LINK AND IMPACT
 3. ALTERNATIVE
- C. What are the different types of kritiks? What are some likely kritiks for this year's topic under each category? (see handout)
 1. **Language kritik**—criticizes the particular language used by a team,
 - “terrorist/terrorism K,”
 - “he/man,”
 - “ethnic conflict,”
 - “middle east”
 2. **Discourse kritik**—criticizes not just the language you use like your word is bad, but instead criticizes the way teams construct your arguments and justifications for action,
 - development K, speaking about other nations as underdeveloped, backwards, and in need of other people to solve their problems for them as justifications for sending in peacekeeping operations
 - terrorism could be a discourse K
 - statist discourse--gives legitimacy to the state by talking about it as an entity separate from the people
 - peace K—talking about peace as absence of war justifies perpetual war by justifying violence as means for achieving peace
 - security discourse K
 - nuclearism K
 3. **Method kritik**—criticizes the means that the affirmative uses to solve,
 - militarism K, using violent means to achieve peace,
 - kritik of debate—using line by line and speed
 - problem solution mentality K
 4. **Epistemology kritik**—criticizes the assumptions of the affirmative's basis for knowing what is and what is not true,
 - realism K, assuming that politics happens on the level of states that act in their own interests
 - statism K
 - feminist international relations K
 - speaking for others K
 - development K
 - nuclear racism K

- which
be alive
5. **Ontology kritik**—criticizes the affirmative’s basis for understanding what it means to be a being in the world
 - biopolitics K, peacekeeping is a way for the government to promote life allows the government to determine for us what it means to
 - hardt and negri’s empire K
 - nihilism K
 - nuclearism K
 6. **Ideology kritik**—criticizes the aff’s assumptions about what is valuable or good,
 - capitalism K, assuming that economic growth is inherently good and necessary
 - democracy promotion K
 - hardt and negri’s empire K

VI. DISCUSSION—IS PERFORMANCE A KRITIK OR IS IT ITS OWN TYPE OF ARGUMENT?

- A. What is performance or alternative styles of debate and argument?
 - questions content through different forms of arguing, i.e. music, poetry, footnoting rather than reading cards, refusing to do the line by line
- B. What does it kritik?
 - dominant forms of debating like line by line and speed
 - dominant forms of argument and logic like problem solving and linear types of thinking
- C. Should it be considered a kritik or its own type of argument and why? Should it even be classified as a type of argument?

VII. TIPS FOR EXTENDING AND WINNING ON THE KRITIK IN THE BLOCK AND THE 2NR (see handout)

1. Should you have a 2NC/1NR overview?
 - yes if your kritik is complicated and needs explaining
 - it should take you no more than 30 seconds to one minute
 - it could be longer if there aren’t many aff answers
 - you could frontload a lot of your link explanations and impacts and alternatives
 - you should tell your judge to flow the overview if you want to frontload these
2. don’t spend all your time on the link and forget the implication and the alternative, the opposite is also true, but generally, you’ll win the link easier than the impact or alternative
3. make sure your alternative competes with the affirmative’s case—how does your alternative solve for the case?
4. Make sure you explain how the affirmative makes the problems outlined in the critique worse
5. Win a case turn, then the alternative becomes less important
6. Write 2NC/1NR blocks to key arguments
 - perms
 - likely link turns

- non-unique
- link and impact extensions
- answer to no alternative
- 7. Group 2AC answers that are similar
- 8. Don't go for everything in the 2NR—you only need to win one link and one key permutation answer
- 9. Read evidence against the perm, it can even be generic permutation evidence, but specific perm evidence for your kritik is best
- 10. BE SPECIFIC! For example, don't just talk about capitalism in general, explain specifically what parts of the plan use capitalist means and how, explain specifically how the bad parts of capitalism will pop up in the implementation of their plan

VIII. ACTIVITY

- break groups of 2 or 3
- give each group a copy of the 1AC (something that comes out in our pre-camp packet)
- have each group come up with their own critique of the affirmative without using evidence
 - have them write up the tags to the shell cards or feel free to be more creative like writing the explanations to the music they are about to play or the movie they are about to show or read a poem or tell a story or whatever they choose
- have each group present what they came up with

TIPS FOR WINNING ON THE KRITIK

1. Have a 2NC overview if your kritik is complicated or needs explaining to the judge
2. don't spend all your time on the link and forget the implication and the alternative, the opposite is also true, but generally, you'll win the link easier than the impact or alternative
3. make sure your alternative competes with the affirmative's case—how does your alternative solve for the case?
4. Make sure you explain how the affirmative makes the problems outlined in the critique worse
5. Win a case turn, then the alternative becomes less important
6. Write 2NC/1NR blocks to key arguments
 - perms
 - likely link turns
 - non-unique
 - link and impact extensions
 - answer to no alternative
7. Group 2AC answers that are similar
8. Don't go for everything in the 2NR—you only need to win one link and one key permutation answer
9. Read evidence against the perm, it can even be generic permutation evidence, but specific perm evidence for your kritik is best
10. BE SPECIFIC! For example, don't just talk about capitalism in general, explain specifically what parts of the plan use capitalist means and how, explain specifically how the bad parts of capitalism will pop up in the implementation of their plan

Types of kritiks handout

Language kritik—criticizes the particular language used by a team

**for example: “terrorist/terrorism” K, using the word terrorist automatically implies negative assumptions about Arabs and Muslims

Discourse kritik—criticizes not just the language you use like your word is bad, but instead criticizes the way teams construct your arguments and justifications for action

**for example: development K, speaking about other nations as underdeveloped, backwards, and in need of other people to solve their problems for them as justifications for sending in peacekeeping operations

Method kritik—criticizes the means that the affirmative uses to solve

**for example: militarism K, using violent means to achieve peace

**for example: the kritik of debate, using traditional forms of debate like line by line and speed

Epistemology kritik—criticizes the assumptions of the affirmative’s basis for knowing what is and what is not true

**for example: realism K, assuming that politics happens on the level of states that act in their own interests

Ontology kritik—criticizes the affirmative’s basis for understanding what it means to be a being in the world

**for example: biopolitics K, peacekeeping is a way for the government to promote life which allows the government to determine for us what it means to be alive

Ideology kritik—criticizes the affirmative’s assumptions about what is valuable or good

**for example: capitalism K, assuming that economic growth is inherently good and necessary

parts of kritiks handout

PARTS OF A KRITIK

*LINK—what does the affirmative *assume*? What do they believe is good or true about the world in order to believe that their plan is a good idea or that their arguments are valid? What do they say or what action do they take that makes problematic assumptions?

**for example—the United States assumes that peacekeeping is a good means of promoting democracy abroad and that this promotion of democracy makes the world and that country a better place.

*IMPACT—why are these assumptions bad? What problems do they lead to? What happens if we allow the assumptions to be made in this specific instance? What are the negative consequences of making these assumptions and/or acting on them through the affirmative?

**for example—promoting democracy is a mask for the extension of the United States domination of the world in which millions of people get exploited everyday and are driven into poverty, starvation, and death

*ALTERNATIVE—how else can we solve the problems that the affirmative is discussing without falling victim to the negative consequences outlined in the kritik? What ways do you propose we can solve the problems that the kritik discusses?

**for example—the alternative to promoting democracy is to allow countries to have self determination, which means that each country should be allowed to decide how they want to govern themselves

Extending & Answering Disadvantages (Basic)

Disadvantages are what we call *causal arguments*. This means that disadvantages must be caused by the plan in some way. In other words, the plan has an effect on something that turns out to be a bad thing. You use disadvantages and hear them all the time. Here are three examples:

- “But mom if I can’t borrow the car Friday night then I won’t be able to go to the movies with my friends and I’ll miss out!”
- “If I buy this DVD then I won’t have enough money to buy that really cool video game when it comes out.”
- “If you don’t study and do well in school you will flunk out and have nothing good happen to you in life.”

Each of these examples is a disadvantage because it contains the three necessary parts of a disadvantage: A link, uniqueness, and an impact. There is another part that disadvantages sometimes have which is called an Internal Link.

Link

In each of these examples it is *because of* some action that the undesirable results. In the first example, you are responding to a plan to prevent you from taking the car on Friday. Every disadvantage must be a result of the plan in some way. This is called a **link**. The link is the part of the disadvantage that demonstrates how the plan puts something in motion that is different from the present system. In the second example, what is the plan and the link?

Uniqueness

Have you ever gotten in trouble for something and used this defense: “But so-and-so did the same thing just the other day and nothing happened!” If so, you are attempting to use the idea of uniqueness to your advantage in that argument.

Uniqueness simply means that the disadvantage must be uniquely caused by the plan. If there is another factor that may cause the disadvantage anyway, then it’s not a reason the plan should be rejected. Looking at example two, the uniqueness of the disadvantage is that you have the money for only the DVD or the video game. If someone responded, “You are going to waste your money on junk food anyway” that would be a challenge to the uniqueness of the disadvantage.

Think about it like this: If there is a new baby in the house, you might hear the disadvantage “Don’t play your music so loud or the baby will cry!” The uniqueness to this argument is that only the music will make the baby cry. Maybe the baby cries for no reason at all, gets hungry, or hears the doorbell. If you can prove that any of those things might happen, then there is no unique reason why playing music is bad.

What is the uniqueness of the third example?

Impact

Impacts are the negative things that happen as a result of the plan. In our examples taken from daily life the impact is assumed. We assume that “missing out” or not having a video game are bad things because our brain makes the jump for us to what the ultimate impacts are. In debate, it’s helpful to think of it as being in a laboratory of argument. Much like a scientist in their laboratory, we want everything spelled out as simple as possible. Because of this, we want our impacts to be very clear and very straightforward with no guess work.

The impact must be connected to the cause of the disadvantage in some way. Usually this will not be a direct connection, and will require other things to happen to get to that point. These connecting pieces are called **internal links**. The internal link is the bridge to get from one cause to another. Take a look at the following very simple disadvantage structure:

Example:

Stuff is not happening now, but when the plan happens, stuff will increase. Stuff kills millions of people.

Example:

Stuff is not happening now, but when the plan happens here comes the stuff. Stuff leads to things, and things cause problems. Problems lead to frustration, frustration leads to illness and illness causes death.

Example A almost never happens in debate because the world is far more complicated than that. Usually when we are dealing with a disadvantage there must be evidence that one thing will cause another. The more internal links a disadvantage has, the weaker the connection. For example, let’s say you are at a party. You might trust your best friend’s friend, but your trust in friends will diminish the more distant each person gets from knowing your friend. How much would you trust your friend’s friend’s friend’s friend?

You should be able to weigh the impacts of the disadvantage against the benefits of the plan. Taking our first example, since we don’t really know what benefit there will be from taking the car away from you on Friday, it’s easy to side with the impact of missing out on fun. But if we learned that the car is needed to take grandma to the hospital for critical health tests, we would probably side with keeping the car for that purpose as the value of life usually outweighs having fun.

[You can discuss the other two examples in this manner with the class time permitting]

Exercises: In each example, try to identify what the plan must do, the link, the uniqueness and the impact of the disadvantage.

[Additional exercises you can have them work in groups if you want]

[How could you improve the clarity of the disadvantage?]

[Could the disadvantage be turned?]

1. If you don't wash your hands after using the bathroom you can spread germs leading to disease.
2. If you eat too much food you won't have any room to eat this delicious cheesecake!
3. If you run away from that fight everyone is going to think you are a total wuss.
4. If the United States spends more money on peacekeeping, it won't have enough money to protect natural resources.
5. If the United States increases its troop commitment to the United Nations, it will weaken the troop strength in Iraq and North Korea, leading to possible attack.
6. If you drink another soda you will become hyperactive and be annoying all afternoon
7. If the UN participates in more peacekeeping operations it will stretch itself too thin and be unable to respond with troops when they are really needed.
8. If you make too much noise the neighbors will be upset and then they might call the cops and then the cops will come and shut down this awesome party

Answering Disadvantages & extending them [Basic]

Disadvantages are very common in debates, so it's good to be prepared to answer them. There are a few basic ways to answer disadvantages, and two that are more advanced. Remember, if the disadvantage doesn't have any of the three parts it needs, it is defeated.

Link Answers

No link – This is where you explain how the link of the disadvantage doesn't apply. This can be determined by closely examining the plan action against the evidence for the link. Consider this example:

Example:

Disadvantage: "If the US increases its troop commitment to the United Nations for peacekeeping it will not be able to provide ample security for Iraq, leading to the collapse of the Iraqi government and the installment of a dictator worse than Saddam Hussein.

Answer: The plan increases support for peacekeeping missions when they happen, so troops may or may not be sent as a part of the mission, meaning they have no link.

You have to examine the evidence carefully to argue a no link. This is something that should be considered carefully as many times the disadvantage link will be too broad and not consider the intricacies of the plan. It is also a good idea to use evidence to argue your point as a good piece of evidence can disprove the link completely.

No Threshold - This means there is not enough of the link in the plan action to trigger the disadvantage:

Example:

Disad: the plan angers the population through funding cuts, leading to riots.

Link evidence: "The population has little tolerance for future cuts in spending, and may react violently if important programs disappear."

Answer: The plan reduces funding, it doesn't cut the funding. According to their evidence, people get upset about eliminations of funding not reductions. This means they don't have enough of a link for their disadvantage, the threshold is not met.

This requires careful examination of the link evidence along with the actions of the plan.

Uniqueness

Attacks on uniqueness simply attempt to prove that the impacts of the disadvantage would happen anyway with the plan:

Example: If you throw your brother across the room, you will break the lamp!
Answer: The lamp is going to break anyway because the dog is running around it and will knock it over.

Of course this is a pretty poor disad as the impact has little to do with the harm that might happen to your brother, but if you can prove the impact will happen regardless of the plan action, you will win the uniqueness and the disadvantage will be defeated.

Another way to attack uniqueness is to prove that it is **empirically denied**. This means that there was a very similar action taken recently that did not result in the impacts of the disadvantage.

Example

Disadvantage: “Plan will cause interest rates to go up, stifling economic growth and leading to unemployment and possibly war”
Answer: “Interest rates were raised last month and the economy is doing quite well [read piece of evidence here]. Therefore, the disadvantage is non-unique.”

This method requires good research and familiarity with what’s happening in the news to make the arguments you need to win.

Impacts

There are three ways of answering impacts of a disadvantage. All of them are based on the idea that if the impact were to happen, it wouldn’t be as bad as the negative team claims.

No Internal Link – This is as simple as it sounds: just like a no link argument, you claim with some evidence that the impact will not happen. You must point out why this internal link is necessary and why the argument falls apart without it.

Example:

Disad: “economic downturn caused by the plan will lead to war”
Answer: “No impact – economic downturn must cause economic collapse to lead to war”

No Impact – This means that the impact claimed by the disadvantage will not happen. This needs to be supported with evidence, but sometimes you can use their own evidence against them.

More Advanced Answers

Link Turns

Remember the earlier example about the baby crying? What if you turned the music on and it prevented the baby from crying? This is an example of a link turn. This response to a disadvantage proves that the disadvantage link actually happens in the opposite direction than what was assumed by the negative.

For example, if the disadvantage link was “increasing US participation in peacekeeping destroys military readiness, causing the US to be vulnerable to attack” the link turn would be “increasing US participation in peacekeeping is the best way to prepare soldiers for combat.” Now the plan helps military readiness and avoids the disadvantage. It’s like the disadvantage becomes a new reason to do the plan.

Impact Turns

What if we planned to have more of the main course at a dinner and someone argued “Don’t eat so much or you won’t be able to have dessert, and it’s great!” We could argue that having more of the main course is better because dessert actually causes more harm because it’s unhealthy. This is an impact turn. In an impact turn, the disadvantage’s impact is argued as a good thing rather than a bad.

Disad: If we stop for food we won’t get to the concert on time and we’ll miss the opening band!

Answer: the opening band will make you want to rip your ears out, they are horrible

This answer to the disad turns the impact, which is assumed in this example to be missing out on something into a positive good – you won’t have to hear the horrible band.

Sometimes this leads to arguments that intuitively don’t make a lot of sense:

Disad: “If you do the plan you will collapse the US economy”

Answer “Collapsing the economy is a good thing – it provides an opportunity to restructure the way we live”

The reason this argument doesn’t persuade you now is the lack of evidence for it, and also that it conflicts with your values. In debate, like in a laboratory, we try to operate as if all possibilities are valid unless someone provides some evidence that they are not. Even if an impact turn doesn’t make a lot of sense to us when we think about it, in debate, if there is evidence for it and none against it, it is considered a good argument. This takes some getting used to, but is important so that all perspectives get a chance to be heard.

Exercises for Part 2:

In each example come up with any kinds of answers that you can. [This could be done in groups and have each group report to the class]

Consider Each possible response: link, uniqueness and impact

Are turns possible?

1. Plan: The US will pay it's debt to the United Nations
Disad: Paying our debt will make the US spend billions of dollars threatening the economy and leading to unemployment
2. Plan: The US should offer it's senior command staff to the UN for peacekeeping missions
Disad: If the US commanders are helping the United Nations, they will not be available to protect the US from terrorism and might lead to someone taking advantage of us and invading, conquering the government.
3. Plan: Let's eat the ice cream in the freezer
Disad: If we eat all of the ice cream there won't be any left for the rest of the family and they might get angry
4. Plan: Let's start our own vegetable garden
Disad: if we have a garden it means we need to work in it all the time and it's hot outside, also we won't be able to relax, drink sodas, and play video games inside
5. Plan: The US should increase support for UN peacekeeping in iraq
Disad: This would be a sign of weakness to other countries and diminish the ability of the United States to be the most powerful nation and lead the rest of the world.
6. Plan: I should subscribe to this magazine I love
Disad: If you subscribe you won't go down to the newsstand and talk to the guy who runs it who always has good advice on fun things to do.

WDI 2004
Flowing Practium
Lecturer's Notes

If the Lecturer wants to have the students practice flowing in the practium. The Lecture has a couple of options. I will suggest three.

1. Have a deck of cards ready, have the students flow each playing card. For each suite, have the student come up with a symbol for it.
2. Have the student read a brief for everyone, this way the students know what to flow.
3. Or try this one. This is for lecturer's who have rhythm and think that they can rhyme. Below is a rap song by Jadakiss, the title is called "Why?" and is a excellent debate song, full with warrants and lists. Have the student flow it.

WDI 2004 Flowing Practicum

What is the flow?

∞ The “flow” refers to something debaters do while the debate is going on. To simply put it the flow is the notes the debater takes of the debate. The flow is usually on written on a “flow sheet” (a piece of paper that is divided up into seven columns) so that the debater and judge can follow the debate in an organize manner. An example of this is below:

1ac	1nc	2ac	2nc / 1nr	1ar	2nr	2ar
-----	-----	-----	-----------------	-----	-----	-----

Why is flowing important?

- * It helps you remember your opponents’ arguments
- * It helps you write and think quicker so that you can answer you opponents’ arguments in a timely manner
- * It helps you win the debate- debaters who don’t flow do not win many debates

How to flow a debate:

1. Divide up your sheet of paper(s) into seven columns (only seven because the 2nc/1nr is considered one speech)
2. During each speech write the “tag” (this is the sentence that describes a piece of evidence the debater reads), the author and year that the debater cites
 - ♣ Remember- you probably won’t be able to write everything down so try to take notes on what is important.

Now Repeat this until the end of the speech
3. Now Next speech- Start a new column, leave some space at the top. It’s going to be a negative speech, so get several pieces of paper for each new argument the negative presents. For example, the negative presents two off-case positions and then decides to go to solvency. On the off-case positions you want to flow the Uniqueness, Link, and Impacts, then on solvency you want to flow the evidence-based and analytical (arguments that have claims and warrants but is not supported by evidence) arguments.

WDI 2004
Flowing Practicum

4. Next speech. It should be the 2ac. The flowing should be the same, only difference the 2ac will address all sheets of paper and will usually refer to the negatives arguments by either number or name. For example, the 2ac could either sound like this: Off the 1nc number one, my first answer is... OR they save plan won't solve, but that is not true because... Then you flow each of the 2ac arguments next to the argument the debater is answering.
5. Repeat step number four until the end of the debate. An example of a complete flow in on the next page.

Practice Flowing: Try flowing

- During a lecture or a class
- While watching T.V. switch to the news, flow the commentary
- While listening to music, try to flow the lyrics of a song
- At Camp- Watch some debates

Flowing tips:

1. Never give up. Flowing is not easy. It takes time to be a good flower. If you stop flowing, then your giving up and losing a value tool that will help you in life. If you missed something, write down the next argument, then in cross ex ask your opponent what their argument was.
2. Try to write everything down. You probably won't be able to, but put all your energy into it. Energetic flowing will help you get psychic for your speech that is coming up.
3. Utilize your partner. They are there to help you. If you think that you missed something or the argument was confusing ask your partner for help.
4. Use short hand. Since writing everything your opponent says will be hard, short hand will help you a lot.
5. Practice, Practice, Practice. Look above.

WDI 2004
Flowing Practicum
Experience

Practice Flowing: Try flowing

- During a lecture or a class
- While watching T.V. switch to the news, flow the commentary
- While listening to music, try to flow the lyrics of a song
- At Camp- Watch some debates

Flowing tips:

1. Never give up. Flowing is not easy. It takes time to be a good flower. If you stop flowing, then your giving up and losing a value tool that will help you in life. If you missed something, write down the next argument, then in cross ex ask your opponent what their argument was.
2. Try to write everything down. You probably won't be able to, but put all your energy into it. Energetic flowing will help you get psychic for your speech that is coming up.
3. Utilize your partner. They are there to help you. If you think that you missed something or the argument was confusing ask your partner for help.
4. Use short hand. Since writing everything your opponent says will be hard, short hand will help you a lot.
5. Leave Space between each argument. At least half an inch.
6. Write less but more. Flow the tag, with a few amount of letters.
7. Think you're an expert flower? Try writing the warrants of the card.

Practice, Practice, Practice. Look above.

WDI 2004
Flowing Practicum
Experience

Common Short Hand Debaters Use

Observation-Obs

Inherency- I with a circle around it

Harms- H with a circle around it

Plan- Pln

Solvency- S with a circle around it

Advantage- Adv

Topicality- T with a circle around it

Disadvantage- D/A

Kritik- K with a circle around it

Counterplan- C/P

Uniqueness- U with a circle around it

Link- L with a circle around it

Impact- !

Nuclear War- N/W or a mushroom
cloud

Turn- T/

Non-unique- N/U

No Link- N/L

No Impact- N/I

United States Federal Government-
USFG

United Nations- UN

George W. Bush- G.W.

Peacekeeping Operations- PKO

Leads to - → arrow pointed right

Key- k

Increase- arrow pointing up ↑

Decrease- arrow pointing down ↓

Create- cr8t

Establish-est

Not, Zero- circle with a slash

Example- i.e. or e.g.

Because- b/c

With- w/

Without- w/o

Therefore- three dots in the shape of a
triangle

Equals, same- =

Change- a triangle

Link Turn-L/T

Impact turn- I/T

Alternate Casualty- AC

Reverse Causal-RC

*** Still need help? With any word you
can take out the
vowels to make it
shorter**

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1AR	2NR	2AR
CONTENTION ONE: HARMS	1. ARGUMENT REASON EVIDENCE	ANSWER REASON EVIDENCE	REBUTTAL LOGICAL POINT		THIS IS A BIG DEAL EXPLAINS WHY	NO IT ISN'T FINAL ANSWER
A. SUB	2. ARGUMENT LOGICAL CHALLENGE	1. ANSWER LOGICAL POINT	REBUTTAL LOGICAL POINT	?		
REASON EVIDENCE	3. ARGUMENT REASON EVIDENCE	2. ANSWER REASON EVIDENCE	REBUTTAL REASON EVIDENCE	REBUTTAL LOGICAL POINT	THIS IS A BIG DEAL EXPLAINS WHY	FINAL ANSWER
REASON EVIDENCE	1. ARGUMENT LOGICAL CHALLENGE	ANSWER LOGICAL POINT	REBUTTAL LOGICAL POINT	REBUTTAL LOGICAL POINT		
B. SUB	2. ARGUMENT REASON EVIDENCE	ANSWER REASON EVIDENCE				
REASON EVIDENCE	3. ARGUMENT REASON EVIDENCE	1. ANSWER LOGICAL POINT	REBUTTAL LOGICAL POINT	?	THIS IS A BIG DEAL	NO IT ISN'T EXPLAINS WHY
REASON EVIDENCE	4. ARGUMENT LOGICAL CHALLENGE	2. ANSWER LOGICAL POINT	REBUTTAL REASON EVIDENCE	REBUTTAL LOGICAL POINT	REBUTTAL LOGICAL POINT	FINAL ANSWER

Negative Strategy – Experienced and Basic

Purpose:

- to practice strategy formation
- to provide specific advise on how to debate new cases.

The Hook:

Begin with a discussion about how people feel about being negative at their first tournament or being at the first tournament – are you scared?..... have a friendly conversation – let it last for 4 or 5 minutes, and then say well lets figure out how to address those fears....

Today we will discuss how to formulate strategies versus cases – what to do on the negative when you don't know what to say.

Before we get into the specifics – we should talk about attitude – how do you look/react/and express those feelings before a debate.....

So you walk in ask the team what affirmative you run and they say “we aren't telling you” OR “it's new” – How do you react?

ATTITUDE

- remember if it is truly a new case – then it is probably new for the other team as well – this gives the negative a huge advantage because while the affirmative must be ready
- stick to your arguments – each person should have one generic argument they consider their pet – whether it be a plan inclusive counterplan like non-violent peace troops, a disad like politics or military readiness, or a kritik like the kritik of peace that can apply to a large number of affirmatives. When you hear a new case the immediate response should be how can I make my arguments link, NOT “what are we going to do”
- don't ever appear frazzled or scared – if you are truly scared...reach into your box and pull out the biggest file and start looking through it for 15 seconds, this will probably shock the other team and give you time to think about what you should pull out.

IN ROUND TACTICS

- The 2n should flow the case – the 1n should begin pulling arguments -
- Before the Cross ex of the 1nc begins, the Negative should take prep time to do the following: (1)establish what will be in the 1nc – this does not mean both people look through the evidence(2) establish which partner will take which argument in the negative block (3) plan out what questions should get asked of the 1ac
- Read the ununderlined portions of the affirmative evidence – frequently there will be other causes of war the affirmative does not address. In the solvency evidence there will frequently be claims that other countries/actors can address the problem.

Before we discuss further – let us talk about what an effective strategy should contain – let’s review from your 1nc and negative block discussions.....

What are the ways in which a negative can win a debate?

1 – Prove the affirmative case should not be allowed/does not meet the resolution –

Topicality, Agent Specification

2 – Prove the affirmative plan is worse than the status quo – UN intervention makes wars worse. Discuss why the affirmative cannot “control the uniqueness on wars” Just because some wars will happen now does not mean that the affirmative does not make wars worse in the future.

3 – Prove the affirmative plan is less desirable than another competitive counterplan option

–

4 – Reframe the question of the debate – argue that the thought process as demonstrated by their language and their actions only reproduces the very harms they try to prevent -

In the 1nc there should be at least 2 of these strategies.....

In the negative block there should be at least 2 offensive arguments (case turns, disads, kritik, topicality are all offensive arguments)

NEW CASE CHECKLIST

– When hearing a new case, how does one devise a strategy

1 Does it meet all the words in the resolution – Start with the obvious – United Nations and Peacekeeping – have a set of definitions for each word – For example maybe establish means create or maybe it means to reaffirm

2 Is there a way I can narrow the debate to revolve around what I do have evidence on?

3 How do my generic strategies apply

EFFECTIVE GENERIC STRATEGIES FOR THE YEAR

(BEGINNER AND EXPERIENCED)

US do it alone Counterplan – Instead of the United States supporting an international effort, just claim that the US effectively parts for the strategy

- UN Fails – UN mismanages funds, UN participates in sex trafficking
- Multilateralism is harmful – The biggest disadvantage to this counterplan is that it US uses diplomatic leverage to level sanctions, wage a war on terror and drugs
- US can effectively peacekeep on its own

Non-Violent Peace Troops Counterplan – If the affirmative does an operation to a country with people who use guns to resolve civil war – instead use unarmed peacekeepers in the spirit of non-violence and the SOUL FORCE Ghandi used

- Military intervention escalates violence
- Non-Violent resistance that addresses the root of the problem prevents wars
- Other nations oppose violent troops – the cp garners greater international support

(EXPERIENCED)

PIC out of the word in the plan – many affirmatives feel the need to restate the resolution within their plan even though it has little impact on their solvency. Take advantage of this – narrow the debate and discuss why the term “peace” or “peacekeeping is harmful”

- Peacekeeping
- Call it troop deployment instead

Another country actor – some good choices include – Japan, the EU, African peacekeeping forces

- Funding trade-off disadvantages (readiness, aid trade-off)
- US Political Disadvantages –
- Advantages to the Counterplan – Japan/EU soft power or US is colonialist let local nations help out

A kritik of international relations –

- International Relations is colonialist, gendered, heterosexist, exclusionary (bleikart)

Kritiks of popular impact arguments

- threat construction
- terror talk
- multilateralism is imperialist – Roland Bleiker

Exercise – Debating the New Case

- Have each student sit with their partner. If their partner is not there, pair them up.
- Have all of the 2ns raise their hands – so they can't say I thought she was the 2n.
- Have an odd person out or the instructor read the case. Have the rest of the students flow.
- Give them all 3 minutes of prep time to identify what arguments they would run in the 1nc and construct cross-ex questions.
- Have an extended cross-ex.
- Give the students 2 more minutes of prep time to create an effective strategy. Share those strategies
- Have the debaters construct LINK Stories and overviews using the evidence read in the debate to the new case as time allows.

What's the 1AC for?

- ✓ It sets up the debate by showing that there is a need for change, presenting a solution, and showing that the solution would be beneficial.
- ✓ It provides a *proof* for the topic.
- ✓ It is the most prepared speech in the debate, so it should be the most practiced and refined speech in the debate.
- ✓ The 1AC should *anticipate* negative arguments that might come up and include answers to those arguments. This makes the job of the 2AC much easier.
- ✓ It makes big *impact* claims to try and prove that the case has a lot of *significance* – in other words, to show that the issue being addressed is important because it affects a lot of people in a serious way.
- ✓ It establishes the presence and the credibility of the affirmative team – this is the first chance the affirmative has to speak.

How do you “anticipate” arguments?

Step 1: Think of what it is that you want to say. What's your argument?

Step 2: Think of what the other team might say in response.

Step 3: Figure out how to answer that argument.

Step 4: Incorporate your response into your original argument.

For example: Let's say that you want to train and deploy U.S. troops to serve as United Nations peacekeepers. You know that the negative team will probably say that committing U.S. troops in this manner will hurt military readiness, decreasing the military effectiveness of the United States. **BUT**, you think you can prove that serving as peacekeepers will actually *help* military readiness by making troops more flexible and adaptable. So, you put some evidence into your 1AC saying that peacekeeping will help train soldiers for other missions. This means that when they make the argument against you, you will have already answered it in the 1AC. The 2AC can just say: “They say that the plan will hurt military readiness, but the Roberts evidence in the 1AC proves that the plan will actually *help* military readiness by increasing military adaptability.”

WDI 2004
Aff Constructives Handout

Argument Anticipation Drill

Below are several assertions. For each assertion, anticipate what the other team might say in response. What will be your answer to that argument? How could you re-phrase your original argument to answer their argument in advance?

- 1. You say that the government should send peacekeeping forces to solve a conflict in Country X. They're going to say that sending troops in will anger Country Y. What will you say? How could you modify the 1AC to answer this argument in advance? HINT: How do you think a war in Country X might affect Country Y?**
- 2. You say that the government should provide reconstruction assistance to Country Z. They're going to say that this would be really expensive, raising the deficit, which would be really bad. What will you say? How could you modify your plan to answer this argument in advance? HINT: There are many ways to pay for policies – what are some other ways the government raises money?**
- 3. You say that the U.S. Navy should deploy a big rapid response force. They're going to say that it would be impossible to immediately deploy this U.S. force. What will you say? How could you modify your proposal to answer this argument in advance?**
- 4. You're going to argue that the U.S. should share its intelligence, including CIA information and satellite data, with the United Nations. What will they say? How might you answer these arguments?**

WDI 2004
Aff Constructives

What's the 2AC for?

- ✓ It re-establishes and re-emphasizes your affirmative case.
- ✓ It should refute (answer) all negative arguments that have been presented so far.
- ✓ The 2AC should not just “play defense.” The 2AC should make “offensive” arguments as well, trying to show how negative arguments are actually arguments for the affirmative side.

How to make “offensive” arguments:

There are two major kinds of “offensive” arguments the 2AC can make. These are called link turns and impact turns.

A link is the statement of an argument's relevance to the issue you are discussing. Let's say you were talking about UN Peacekeeping, and the other team started talking about space exploration in a way that seemed unrelated to your plan. If you said that this argument was not related to your plan, you would be saying that the argument had “no link.”

An impact is the statement of an argument's ultimate consequence. So in the UNSAS affirmative case, the impacts of not doing the plan are things like war, genocide, famine, and so forth.

As you may know, when you turn an argument, you are saying that an argument made by the other side is actually an argument for your side.

So, a link turn happens when you can reverse their link to your plan. For example: the negative team says your plan would hurt the economy, You could just say that your plan doesn't affect the economy. That would take out their link to your plan. OR, you could say that your plan actually *helps* the economy. That would be a *turn* to their link.

An impact turn happens when you can reverse the *impact* to their argument. The easiest way to remember how to turn an impact is this: An impact turn is where EITHER they say something is bad but you say it's good, OR the other way around.

WDI 2004
Aff constructives

Practicing Link Turns:

Pretend you are on the affirmative side, arguing for the UNSAS case. Below are several arguments the negative team might make. Explain how you might “turn” the link to each one.

1. **“The plan will hurt military contractors, which will be bad for the economy.”**
2. **“The plan will be unpopular, which will hurt the President’s ability to win the war on terrorism.”**
3. **“The plan will only postpone conflicts, but won’t solve them. This will hurt civilians even more.”**
4. **“The plan will make other countries mad, because they will think the U.S. is pressuring them to contribute troops to the UN as well.”**
5. **“The plan will hurt social movements that oppose U.S. unilateralism, because if you use the UN, you take away their cause, hurting their ability to mobilize for change. Social movements are important because they allow for better social change.”**
6. **“The plan will hurt U.S. leadership, because it will make the U.S. seem like it’s backing off and handing over responsibility to the U.N.”**

Counterplanning 101:

You already know what a counterplan is. In every day life, you use counterplans all the time:

Friend: "I'm hungry. Let's go get hamburgers."

You: "Let's get Chinese food instead."

A counterplan is an "instead" argument for the negative side. The "instead" part is where you're making a claim that your plan (Chinese food) is a reason to reject their plan (hamburgers). We make "instead" decisions between plans and counterplans on a daily basis. For example, every morning here at the World Debate Institute, we have to decide whether we are going to class or staying in bed. Clearly, if we stay in bed we cannot go to work. These two options are **competitive**. That is, they compete for the same resources and time. A counterplan is an "instead" option for the negative team.

Counterplans are everywhere in practical decision making. How do counterplans work in debate? The negative team needs to win the debate by showing that the affirmative's team is a bad idea. So what a counterplan needs to do in a debate is show that the judge should not vote for the affirmative team; *instead*, the judge should vote for the negative's counterplan.

To successfully run a counterplan, you will need to show that the counterplan is **counter to the plan**: why it is an "instead" option. We say that a counterplan is **competitive** with a plan when it *forces a choice* between the two proposals. If you are trying to win a debate with a counterplan, that counterplan must be competitive with the affirmative's plan. Otherwise, it's not **counter** to the plan. This is shown using the following example:

Friend: "I'm hungry. Let's go get hamburgers."

You: "Let's get Chinese food instead."

Friend: "Well, why don't we get hamburgers *and* Chinese food?"

You: "Oh. Okay."

Exercise: Understanding Opportunity Cost

You use counterplans all the time in your everyday life. For example, this morning you had to make the choice to either get out of bed and go to class, or to stay in bed and sleep. Did you actually do both options to see which was better? Did you need to?

You also use counterplans when you are trying to make decisions about how to get around town. When you want to go out with your friends, you have to decide whether you will take the bus, the train, a taxi, a friend's car, a motor scooter, a bicycle, a skateboard, a pony, or just walk. So you consider potential counterplans all the time when you are making decisions. If you decide to take the bus, you are therefore deciding to forego the other opportunities you might have had. These lost opportunities are called the *opportunity cost* of your action.

In debate, a counterplan is a statement of an opportunity cost of the plan. That's how the counterplan is *counter* to the plan – you're saying that if doing both the plan and the counterplan would be a bad idea (or perhaps impossible, as in the case of staying in bed and going to class), and the counterplan *alone* is the best alternative, then the counterplan is a reason to vote against the plan. It's just like arguing a disadvantage.

Let's try a few exercises.

Below is a list of different actions. For each action, think of at least three opportunity costs you would give up if you were to take the action. What could you do *instead*? Why would that be an *instead* option?

- 1. Restrict the transfer of copyrighted music on the Internet.**
- 2. Give all students a free college education.**
- 3. Criminally penalize chemical industries for water pollution.**
- 4. Increase spending for AIDS treatment.**

WDI 2004
Basic Division
Answering Counterplans

Here are some counterplans against UNSAS. Assume that you are affirmative. In the 1NC, the other team ran this counterplan. You have 5 minutes to work with a partner to come up with answers to the counterplan. After your 5 minutes is up, your team should present 2 minutes of arguments against the counterplan.

Be creative. Try to have arguments about why the plan is good *and* arguments about why the counterplan is bad. You may use your affirmative evidence to help you think of arguments.

- 1. The US Federal Government should consult its allies about whether or not the plan is a good idea. Depending on what the allies say, we will either implement the plan or not.**
- 2. NATO will supply 30,000 troops for the UN's UNSAS program.**
- 3. The president should set up a special commission to study the desirability of contributing troops to UNSAS. After a 1-year period, if that commission so recommends, the US federal government will do the plan.**
- 4. The United Nations should eliminate the Security Council.**
- 5. The United States should eliminate Presidential Decision Directive 25.**

A Short Glossary for Counterplans

Competitiveness: An argument for testing the legitimacy of a counterplan in a debate. The presence of the counterplan should force a choice for the decision maker between the policies advocated by the affirmative plan and the counterplan. Competition is the quality of a policy that makes it a reason to reject another policy.

Counterplan: A policy proposed by the negative team. The policy must offer a reason to reject the affirmative's plan in the debate. Generally, the counterplan will try to solve the affirmative's harms in a more beneficial way, such as by "avoiding," or not linking to, disadvantages that link to the affirmative's plan.

Mutual Exclusivity: A claim that it is impossible for the affirmative's plan and the negative's counterplan to coexist.

Net Benefits: A standard for counterplan competition. A counterplan is said to be "net beneficial" when it alone is a policy option superior to the whole plan and all or any part of the counterplan. In other words, the counterplan should force a choice between the policies advocated by the affirmative and the negative in a debate.

Permutation: A test of the competitiveness of a counterplan or counterposition. The permutation is an argument that explains how the functions of the plan and counterplan are *complementary* and mutually supportive. More practically, a permutation is a type of argument used by affirmatives to show that counterplans are not competitive. Affirmatives argue that if it is possible to imagine the coexistence of the plan and the counterplan, and if such an imagined example would be net beneficial, then the counterplan does not provide a reason to reject the affirmative.

World Debate Institute 2004

REFUTATION PRACTICUM HANDOUT

1. WHAT'S AN ARGUMENT? A-R-E –
 ASSERTION: A statement, or claim, about the world.
 REASONING: The “because” of your assertion.
 EVIDENCE: The proof of your “because” or assertion.

2. IN DEBATE, ARGUMENTS MUST HAVE AN ADDITIONAL COMPONENT, WHICH IS THE *IMPACT*. AN IMPACT IS A STATEMENT OF WHY THE ARGUMENT MATTERS IN THE DEBATE.

3. WHAT IS **REFUTATION**? BASIC 4-STEP PROCESS:
 1. THEY SAY...,
 2. BUT...,
 3. BECAUSE...,
 4. THEREFORE...

WHY DOES REFUTATION MATTER?

**SPEAKER 1: BANANAS ARE BETTER THAN ORANGES.
SPEAKER 2: ORANGES ARE BETTER THAN BANANAS.**

**SPEAKER 1: BANANAS ARE BETTER THAN ORANGES BECAUSE BANANAS CONTAIN POTASSIUM.
SPEAKER 2: ORANGES ARE BETTER THAN BANANAS.**

**SPEAKER 1: BANANAS ARE BETTER THAN ORANGES BECAUSE BANANAS CONTAIN POTASSIUM.
SPEAKER 2: ORANGES ARE BETTER THAN BANANAS BECAUSE ORANGES CONTAIN VITAMIN C.**

**SPEAKER 1: BANANAS ARE BETTER THAN ORANGES BECAUSE BANANAS CONTAIN POTASSIUM.
SPEAKER 2: ORANGES ARE BETTER THAN BANANAS BECAUSE ORANGES CONTAIN VITAMIN C. YOU DON'T GET A LOT OF VITAMIN C IN YOUR REGULAR DIET, BUT YOU DO GET A LOT OF POTASSIUM.**

**SPEAKER 1: BANANAS ARE BETTER THAN ORANGES BECAUSE BANANAS CONTAIN POTASSIUM.
SPEAKER 2: ORANGES ARE BETTER THAN BANANAS BECAUSE ORANGES CONTAIN VITAMIN C. YOU DON'T GET A LOT OF VITAMIN C IN YOUR REGULAR DIET, BUT YOU DO GET A LOT OF POTASSIUM. THEREFORE, WHEN GIVEN THE CHOICE YOU SHOULD ALWAYS PREFER AN ORANGE TO A BANANA.**

YOU HAVE A VARIETY OF CHOICES WHEN ANSWERING ARGUMENTS. FOR EXAMPLE, YOU COULD:

- DENY THE ARGUMENT AND SHOW THAT ITS OPPOSITE IS TRUE.**
- DENY THE ARGUMENT AND SAY ITS REASONING IS FAULTY.**
- SHOW THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE FOR THE ARGUMENT.**
- SHOW THAT THE ARGUMENT IS IRRELEVANT. (“EVEN IF...”)**
- SHOW THAT THE ARGUMENT IS INCONSISTENT WITH OTHER ARGUMENTS IN THE DEBATE.**
- SHOW THAT YOU’VE ALREADY ANSWERED THE ARGUMENT ELSEWHERE OR IN ANOTHER WAY.**

WE SUGGEST THAT YOU EMPLOY THE FOLLOWING TESTS FOR ARGUMENTS:

TEST IT FOR RELEVANCE
MINIMIZE IT
TURN IT
ANSWER IT

STAY ON TARGET. SOMETIMES THERE ARE ARGUMENTS THAT ARE RELEVANT BUT WILL NOT WIN YOU THE DEBATE – I.E., THE PARTIAL SOLVENCY ARGUMENT MEETS ALL OF THE TESTS DESCRIBED ABOVE, BUT IS STILL A POOR HORSE TO BET ON.

A FEW FINAL TIPS:

- USE GOOD WORD ECONOMY.
- KNOW WHY YOU ARE ANSWERING THE ARGUMENT YOU ARE ANSWERING.

Here are some sample claims for you to practice your refutation skills. Answer each argument by using the 4-step refutation method:

1. "They say..."
2. "But..."
3. "Because..."
4. "Therefore..."

Here's an example. The **claim** is: The Backstreet Boys are a great band.

1. "They say the Backstreet Boys are a great band..."
2. "But they are actually a bad band..."
3. "Because they don't play any instruments and all their songs sound like that music you hear in elevators..."
4. "Therefore, the Backstreet Boys are not a good band."

Sample Claims

1. Cellular phones should be allowed in schools.
2. The United States should significantly increase space exploration.
3. Television is a bad influence.
4. The United States should lower the voting age.
5. Torture is justified for national security.
6. Junk food should be banned in schools.
7. State lotteries should be ended.
8. School should be year-round.
9. The United States should eliminate its own weapons of mass destruction.
10. Peer pressure is more beneficial than harmful.
11. Schools should not use standardized testing.
12. Human cloning should be permitted in the United States.
13. The United States should ban the death penalty..
14. Schools should ban animal dissection.
15. School attendance should be voluntary.
16. Violent video games should be banned.
17. Parents should not purchase war toys for their children.
18. There should be mandatory drug testing for participation in extracurricular activities.

Understanding Evidence

Evidence is proof provided to support reasoning. When you provide evidence for your arguments, you are communicating a piece of information that supports your conclusion. As you might expect, ideas are stronger when backed by information. Your audience will be more likely to agree with your ideas if you can show that they are supported by solid evidence.

Types of Evidence

1. Examples and Illustrations. When you look at a dictionary, you may find that some words have pictures next to their definitions. These are illustrations, meant to clarify the meaning of the word by giving an example: an apple, a tree, or a chair. An example is a kind of illustration, offered as a demonstration of the issue under discussion. You offer an example when you describe a time and place when something has happened. Examples are the most common kind of evidence.

- **Historical Examples.** An historical example shows a time when the reasoning has been true in the past.
- **Contemporary Examples.** A contemporary example shows that the reasoning is true now.
- **Hypothetical Examples.** Hypothetical examples deal with events that have not come to pass, but might if a certain chain of events happens.

2. Statistical Data. You might encounter the most common kind of statistical evidence when you look at surveys or “polls” that are taken in your community, nationally, or internationally. Statistical evidence tells us something about a group of people or a set of actions or objects. You might see polls that say, for example, that 75% of people surveyed prefer flavored ice cream to unflavored ice cream. Although this kind of evidence, like any evidence, can be manipulated to serve a particular purpose, it is commonly used to prove different kinds of arguments or establish different facts about the world.

3. Quotations from Experts. Sometimes you may use quotations from experts in a particular field to bolster your arguments or to support your reasoning. These quotations can be helpful to establish the authority of your position and to establish that a consensus exists in support of your argument. Make sure you use approved citation procedures (such as MLA citation) when you use quotations from experts.

4. Personal Experience. A personal experience or anecdote is a kind of example that is drawn from your own experience and observation. Personal stories can help establish your credibility as a speaker by showing you have experience and understanding of the issue.

Evaluating Evidence

It is important to critically evaluate evidence that you present and evidence that is presented by others. Evidence is the underpinning of argument. Arguments without evidence are not arguments, but rather unsubstantiated reasons. Here are a few questions you might ask about any kind of evidence:

- **Does the evidence support the reasoning?**
- **Has the fact been true for all time, or are there examples of times when it hasn't been true?**
- **Is the evidence credible? Does it come from a credible source? Is it supported by others?**
- **Is there evidence that counters it?**

Evaluating Examples

- Are there enough examples to prove the claim?
- Are there examples that might directly counter the example?
- Are the examples typical? Are they representative of a large sample of people, places, or similar events?

Evaluating Statistics

- Who did the study?
- Who was asked?
- How many were asked?
- What were they asked?
- Is there other evidence that backs it up?

Evaluating Expert Testimony

- Is the person actually an expert?
- Is the person an expert in the field under discussion?
- Are there other experts that might contradict that expert?
- Is the expert's observation consistent with common sense or personal experience?
- Is the expert being quoted to offer reasoning or evidence? If the expert is just providing reasoning, where's the evidence?
- Is the source biased about the topic? Could there be a conflict of interest at work?

Evaluating Personal Experience

- Is there anyone else who has had similar experiences or observations?
- Is the experience a one-time occurrence, or does it repeat over time?

What Makes a Source Qualified?

With the increase in Web publishing, anyone can now easily become a published author. But just because someone has published something on the Web, this does not mean the author is automatically a good source. One critical question you must face when researching and citing works is deciding which authors will count as *qualified* sources and which will not. Here are a few tips to help you decide if you are citing qualified sources.

Field Matters

Let's say you want to cite an author who has a doctorate or is otherwise well-known. You must try to make sure that the author is writing in her field of expertise. For example, while it might be wise to cite Julia Roberts on the craft of acting, it might not be wise to cite her on engineering effective nuclear disarmament. In general, you might want to consider the following considerations when determining *field*:

- Does the author hold an advanced degree (M.A., M.S., Ph.D., M.D., etc) in the field about which they are writing?
- Do the authors have extensive experience in the field? Have the authors done extensive research in the field they are discussing? (NOTE: you can usually find out what else the author has published by doing a simple Google search on the author's name)

Peer Review Matters

There is a big difference between regular publications and publications that are *peer-reviewed*. When an article is peer reviewed, it is evaluated by peers of the author to determine whether the article should be revised. Reviewers usually do not know the identity of the author. This is to ensure that their reviews are neutral and fair. Many journals on the Internet and elsewhere are peer-reviewed. Most scholars agree that publications that are peer reviewed are subject to more rigorous criticism and evaluation.

Is it Fact or Opinion?

Sometimes an author will be writing from her own opinions. This might happen when she is writing an editorial piece for a newspaper or a commentary for a Web site. Other times, an author is simply reporting the facts about an issue or situation. So, for example, the author might be summarizing information gleaned elsewhere without trying to put a particular spin on this information. If you know what sort of piece this writing is meant to be, you can more fairly assess whether or not the author is qualified to write it.

Who Are They With?

Sometimes authors who seem very qualified can be associated with organizations that are very biased or less than objective on the issues. It is important to know what organization the author is with and to find out about that organization, if you can. Most of the time, a simple search in Google will tell you what you need to know about the organization. Look at the rest of the Web site, if you found the article online. Who else is posting on this Web site? What are their qualifications? Sometimes it's important to know the company that your author keeps.

How old is it?

It is important to know when your article was written. Has it been republished since its original publication date? Are there more recent articles that support or contradict the author's point? Recency matters. If evidence is more recent, then it can sometimes be said that it trumps older evidence.

Can you find the same information in another source?

Sometimes it is useful to try and find the same information in another source. If multiple authors are citing the same information, it is more probably true than false. This kind of fact-checking can be very useful if you want to make sure your sources are air-tight.

Kate's Exercise Grab-Bag
May 2004

1. Give an Example. In the list below, you will find statements about various everyday events. Each statement ends with "For example," Your assignment is to finish each sentence with an example of the behavior, idea, or issue being discussed by the speaker.

- a. People today do not eat enough nutritious foods. For example,
- b. Traffic in our community is really bad. For example,
- c. Sometimes schools do not teach students the things they need to learn. For example,
- d. All students should learn another language. This would help them in their lives. For example,
- e. Many people are not interested in politics. For example,
- f. The freedom of speech is important. For example,
- g. People regularly break some laws. For example,
- h. There are some things you cannot plan for. For example,
- i. Sometimes, you need to be patient. For example,

2. Analyze the Ad. Here are four short claims made by four imaginary advertisements. For each claim, come up with at least three questions you'd like to have answered before you would buy the product. Write these questions on a separate piece of paper. Be specific!

- a. Cats and their owners agree that no cat food is better than Fish-Ums!
- b. You should try the great taste of Itsa Pudding, now with real milk!
- c. I play a doctor on television. For a nutritious lunch, I eat a Flav-o-Bar!
- d. 99% of teenagers surveyed say that Eagle shampoo is the best!

3. Fill in the Blanks. In the chart below, you will find assertions, reasoning, and evidence – each row represents a complete argument. Some arguments are missing one or more of their parts. Your assignment is to fill in the missing parts. Try to be as specific as you can be.

	Assertion	Reasoning	Evidence
1	The minimum driving age should be raised to 18.	Raising the driving age will save lives by reducing accidents.	16-year-old drivers have three times as many crashes as drivers aged 18 and 19.
2	Television is a bad influence.	Television shows too much violence.	
3	The United States should not have the death penalty.		Since 1973, 108 people in 25 states have been released from death row because they were found innocent.
4		Eating junk food is bad for your health.	Junk foods are high in fat and sugar. Too much fat and sugar puts you at risk for diabetes and heart disease.
5		Allowing younger people to vote would increase their involvement in politics and society.	
6			Incidents of school violence have shown that students use their cellular phones to notify police and parents.
7	Schools should not use animal dissection in classes.		

4. Find the A-R-E. Look at a selection of advertisements from magazines or newspapers. Pick three different ads. For each advertisement, figure out what assertion is being made, what reasoning is offered, and what evidence is presented. Be specific, and present your results using an A-R-E chart (like the one below) for each ad:

What product is being sold? _____ Assertion: _____ _____ Reasoning: _____ _____ Evidence: _____ _____ _____
--

Were you convinced to buy the product? If not, why? Was the reasoning weak for the ads? How so? How could the reasoning in the ads be improved?

5. Explain the Effects. Below is a list of events. Pick an event and brainstorm three major results of your event. Give a short speech (1-2 minutes) where you explain the event and its potential results. Use what you know about giving introductions and conclusions to make your speech complete. For example, if you picked “earthquake,” you might expect that an earthquake would cause buildings to collapse, people to panic, and possibly even some deaths. In your speech, you should explain a little more about each of these effects, helping the audience to *visualize* the effects of the event.

- a. A major flood
- b. Winning the lottery
- c. A large forest fire
- d. Getting accepted to a major university
- e. Joining the Army
- f. Cleaning your house
- g. Breaking an arm
- h. Walking your dog

6. Explain the Causes. Below is a list of events. For each event, brainstorm at least three things that could have caused the event. Remember that events have more than one cause, and some causes can be more important than other causes. Be specific. Ask yourself: “Why did this happen?” or “What caused this state of affairs?”

- a. You decide to go to college.
- b. You eat a salad for dinner.
- c. Roger turns off his television.
- d. There is an election at your school.
- e. All schools stop selling junk food.

- f. The United States allows people to have handguns.
- g. Students bring cellular phones to school.
- h. You break your arm.

7. **Costs and Benefits.** In the chart below, you will find columns labeled *action*, *benefits*, and *costs*. Pretend that you are considering whether each action should be taken. For each action that is described, you should come up with at least 2 costs and 2 benefits of taking that action. Do the benefits outweigh the costs for each action? Why or why not? Explain. What decision would you make for each proposed action?

Action	Benefits	Costs
The city council is considering spending 2 million dollars to improve roads. Is this a good idea?	1. 2.	1. 2.
Should the school board hire 50 new teachers for middle schools in the district?	1. 2.	1. 2.
You are considering quitting the baseball team to work on the school newspaper. Should you?	1. 2.	1. 2.
Your state is considering a ban on sport utility vehicles. Would this be a good idea or a bad idea?	1. 2.	1. 2.

8. **Name That Problem!** Below, you will find a list of proposals. Your job is to come up with one “offensive” argument against each proposal. This means that for each proposal, you must come up with one *problem* that might be created by the proposal. You must also show a *result*, which is a reason why that problem would be bad. Here’s an example:

Proposal: There is too much logging going on in American forests. What we need to do is to ban all logging in American forests, so that we can preserve our trees.

Problem: If we ban all logging in the United States, the timber industry will collapse, because there’s no work for loggers any more.

Result: This means that millions would be out of work and in poverty, unable to feed their families or pay rent.

Remember that there is no right answer for these exercises. Any proposal might cause any number of problems. If you have trouble thinking of a problem, use your *issue analysis* skills to think about questions like: Who’s involved? Why are they involved? Who would be affected by the proposal?

- a. **Proposal:** American children have too many cavities in their teeth. What we need to do is stop the sale of all candy bars to children under 18. This will help children have fewer cavities and better teeth.
 - b. **Proposal:** The country of Atlantastan has gotten nuclear weapons. What we need to do is invade them to take away their nuclear weapons. This will stop them from using their weapons.
 - c. **Proposal:** Students at our school are having a lot of trouble learning math. What we need to do is to have a school-wide math test every day. This will allow us to make sure that all children are learning math.
 - d. **Proposal:** The air in our community is too polluted. What we need to do is to ban people from driving with only one person in their car. Everyone must car-pool. This will reduce pollution in the air by having fewer cars driving.
 - e. **Proposal:** There are too many deaths by handguns in this country. What we need to do is to make handguns illegal. This will mean that fewer people will die from gun violence each year.
 - f. **Proposal:** Candidates in elections take too much money from special interests. This means that lobbying groups, such as the groups that represent different industries, have too much influence over politics. What we need to do is stop all groups from giving money to campaigns. This will mean that candidates will only be able to use their own money in elections.
 - g. **Proposal:** Children these days watch too much violence on television. What we need to do is make sure that there is no violence at all on television before midnight every day. This will mean that children will not see violence on television.
-

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

John Meany, Claremont Colleges

COUNTERPLANNING

GOAL To prepare students to design, prepare, utilize, and refute a counterplan

NOTE Students must understand basic principles of argumentation and refutation, as well as the strategic goals of affirmative and negative teams in a debate, in order to participate in this session. To ensure the success of the lesson, it is advisable to review the following issues with students prior to the counterplan session:

- Structure of an argument: A-R-E/Assertion-Reasoning-Evidence
- Core design of the traditional affirmative plan
- Fundamentals of negative strategy
- Hypothetical nature of negative arguments
- Relation of negative arguments to affirmative proof claims
- Principles of refutation (tests of relevance, significance, agency)

OBJECTIVES The lesson develops counterplanning skills and outcomes based on the following method:

- Explain the strategic goals of the negative team and explore argument options
- Define a counterplan (*opportunity cost* and *competing alternative*)
- Provide examples of counterplans in daily, popular, and public policy argument
- Explain argument anticipation of affirmative cases/plans
- Consider and list potential counterplans, based on argument anticipation
- **Practicum (Exercise 1)**
 - Discuss the formal elements of a counterplan
 - Text requirements
 - Discuss the theoretical issues of a counterplan
 - Nontopicality
 - Competition
 - Mutual exclusivity
 - Redundancy
 - Philosophical
 - Discursive
 - Net benefits
- **Practicum (Exercise 2)**
 - Exclusion, Conditional, Dispositional, Provisional
 - Discuss the practical issues of a counterplan: significance and impact/evaluation
 - Organize the text of a counterplan and its theoretical and practical elements
 - Discuss the presentation of a counterplan and speaker responsibilities

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

- **Practicum**

Students are presented with a plan and, working in teams, will design and organize a counterplan to refute the plan. **(Exercise 3)**

The 1NC (or designated team member) makes a counterplan presentation from a prepared text and/or from a design of a student team. **(Exercise 4)**

- Examine myths of counterplanning

1. Negative must defend or advocate a position in the debate
2. A counterplan is a formal policy
3. Negative fiat
4. A counterplan is a concession of the affirmative case
5. A counterplan, by definition, tries to better achieve the affirmative advantages
6. Nontopicality

- Answering Counterplans

1. Examine speaker responsibilities for the affirmative respondents
2. Discuss argument anticipation and adaptation of the case to address counterplan strategies
3. Define permutations.
4. Discuss permutation argumentation and examine several permutations for proposed counterplans.

- **Practicum (Exercise Review)**

- Students are presented with a plan and several counterplans. Students determine which of the counterplans are competitive and which do not and explain their reasoning.

OUTLINE

Section 1. Preparation for the Lesson

Review the role of the negative team, the hypothetical nature of argumentation, the varied argument options for the negative side, A-R-E, and speaker responsibilities.

Section 2. Introduction to Counterplanning

Define a counterplan, using the economic language of “opportunity cost” or the public policy language of “competing alternative/forced choice.” Provide multiple examples of counterplanning in daily life (menu and movie choices, decision to attend school or stay at home, decision to attend WDI, etc.) Provide several examples of counterplans in public policy argument (transportation planning, volunteer army, environmental regulations.)

Introduce the UN peacekeeping topic and begin preliminary argument anticipation based on topic language (the exploration of imagined alternatives.) Create a list of potential counterplans.

Section 3. Organization of a Counterplan

Consider, in logical order, each of the elements of a counterplan, including formal text, theoretical requirements, and practical benefits. Explore and discuss each of the elements, with particular and detailed attention to the issue of counterplan competition. Students deliver the counterplan section of a first negative constructive speech during a presentation practicum exercise.

Section 4. Disposition of Counterplans

Discuss popular and mistaken myths of counterplanning; examine counterplanning from the perspective of the affirmative team, considering the role of each speaker in replying to a counterplan, as well as theoretical and substantive replies to a counterplan. Students participate in a competition practicum, assessing the legitimacy of particular counterplans, which are tested against a single plan.

EXERCISES

Exercise 1. Developing Alternatives: Brainstorming and Preliminary Research

A. Present students with a copy of the debate topic and request that they discover alternatives for the agent and action sections of topic. List the alternatives on a whiteboard.

B. Present students a copy of an index page of a search engine (e.g., Google page.) The index page should be based on a keyword search for alternatives to elements of the topic. For example, the index page can be based on a search for “alternatives to peacekeeping” or “alternatives to UN peacekeeping.” Students should identify alternatives and websites that might produce information on alternatives. This should be followed with research assignments to locate and review the web materials on alternatives.

Exercise 2. Specific Alternatives

Students should receive a copy of an affirmative plan. Have students, working in teams or small groups; prepare a list of alternatives to the affirmative plan. Students should make suggestions of desirable counterplans. The student presentation should include an explanation of the counterplan’s relevance (competition.) A discussion on competition in the context of the particular affirmative plan should follow.

Exercise 3. Designing a Counterplan

Students should take 1-2 sample counterplans from Exercise 2 and organize and outline a counterplan, including the text of the counterplan, theoretical requirements (for the purposes of the exercise, students should explain nontopicality and competition), and a list of advantages/net benefits.

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

Exercise 4. Presenting a Counterplan

Students should make an oral presentation of a prepared or drafted counterplan. Each student should deliver a counterplan verbally and other students should practice note taking during the session.

EXERCISE MATERIALS

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| Exercise 1. | Appendix 1 |
| Exercise 2. | Produce a copy of an affirmative plan (WDI sample affirmative is sufficient.) |
| Exercise 4. | Produce a copy of an counterplan (WDI sample or a student or instructor produced sample will be sufficient) |

WDI 2004
Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

- **Counterplan** – an argument that reveals an opportunity cost. An opportunity cost is the sacrifice that one would make in taking one course of action instead of another.

In its function for the negative team in a debate, a counterplan plays the same role as a disadvantage. It is a hypothetical argument, suggesting that the affirmative team's plan would produce a cost, namely an opportunity cost. In an ideal form, the negative side uses a counterplan to prove that the cost of the lost opportunity is greater than the sum of the advantages of the affirmative team in the debate. If the lost opportunity were greater than the affirmative's advantage, a judge would decide for the negative team due to the fact that the affirmative has failed to meet its significance burden initiated in the opening speech in the debate. (In the 1AC, the affirmative suggests that it would 'win' the debate because its advantages are preferred to ongoing costs. If the negative is able to prove that the costs of the affirmative plan are greater than the affirmative team's advantages, then the affirmative team has not met its own standards of proof and, therefore, loses the debate in its own terms. In other words, a judge does not technically vote "for" a counterplan but "against" an affirmative team's plan, with the counterplan as an explanation of one or more problems with the affirmative plan.)

In a debate the negative side introduces a counterplan, which is formally designed as an alternative policy to the affirmative team's plan of action (that is, proposed solution or reform). For example, on a topic directing the affirmative team to increase US support for UN peacekeeping operations, the negative team might propose that the US withdraw from UN peacekeeping operations. The negative team would be prepared to argue that this was a genuine opportunity cost directly related to the affirmative team's plan. In other words, if the US increased its support for UN peacekeeping, it would lose the opportunity of withdrawing from UN peacekeeping missions – the US would lose the opportunity to undermine support for the United Nations.

A counterplan text typically includes the same formality as an affirmative plan (action agent, series of proposed actions, disposition of funding enforcement and other matters of policy implementation, etc.) In addition, a counterplan presentation, almost always by the first negative constructive (1NC) speaker, typically includes the counterplan text, an explanation of its relevance in the debate (competition), and any attendant advantages of the counterplan (descriptions of the opportunity costs of the affirmative plan.)

- **Competition** – an argument establishing the relevance of a counterplan in a debate. Arguments by a negative team in a debate are relevant in circumstances in which they undermine the arguments by the affirmative team. This may be evident in theory (the role of the negative team is to dispute and/or dispose the arguments initially proffered by the affirmative team) but it is not always the case in practice.

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

An argument of competition, often labeled as the *competitiveness* (for example, “the competitiveness of a counterplan”), is simply a way of describing that a counterplan is a relevant argument, that it, in fact, undermines the affirmative team’s position in a debate. There are popular, varied, and evolving expressions of competition, including:

Mutual exclusivity – This is a traditional or classical understanding. In this case, the negative team argues that a counterplan is a relevant or competing alternative policy if only one policy suggested by the affirmative team and negative team in a debate, the plan or counterplan but not both, is achievable. This is usually based on the physical or logical impossibility of simultaneously endorsing the plan and the counterplan (that is, if the plan has a value = A, and the counterplan has a value = not A, it is not logical for a world in which A and not A exist. For example, it might be logistically and logically impractical to have the US support UN peacekeeping operations and, at the same time, withdraw support from UN peacekeeping operations.)

Redundancy – This argument claims that an effective action (a negative team’s counterplan which generally addresses the affirmative team’s problem area) nullifies, moots, or makes redundant another action. For example, if the US used its own troops to resolve a political or humanitarian crisis in another country (Sudan, for example) it would be redundant for the UN to also send peacekeeping troops to the Sudan.

Philosophical/Discursive – This argument claims that the philosophical, ethical, or ideological positions of the affirmative team and negative team are incompatible and, therefore, a counterplan which disputes the philosophy, understanding, or perspective of the affirmative team is incompatible with the affirmative team’s position in a debate.

These understandings of competition are subsets, however, of a more comprehensive and cohesive argument establishing the relevance, the competition, of an affirmative team’s plan and negative team’s counterplan – *net benefits*.

Net benefits – This is a direct formulation of the concept of a counterplan as an argument revealing an opportunity cost. The claim made by the negative team using this argument is that the affirmative team’s plan directs a particular action, that action is unwise, the counterplan (as a hypothetical alternative) reveals that there are possible alternative actions (that would be sacrificed by taking the action proposed by the affirmative team), and that the selected alternative is superior to that proposed by the affirmative team. The counterplan has a net benefit. This is simply the inverse of the claim that the counterplan reveals an opportunity cost of the affirmative plan.

As previously noted, other measures of competition are subsets of “net benefits.” *Mutual exclusivity*? One could, in fact, introduce impractical policy choices but it would not be wise

WDI 2004
Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

to do so. One might lose the ‘benefit’ of logical and coherent public policy. *Redundancy?* One could use more than one agent to resolve a problem. But if the first party to the scene corrects the problem, sending additional support wastes personnel and resources. One would lose the benefits associated with those people and materials. *Philosophical differences?* One could introduce policies that are ideologically incompatible (in politics, this is referred to as “compromise” and is a regular staple of policymaking) but one might forego the opportunity of undermining a popular myth or perspective that might make for more compelling social policy or might assist individuals in other, seemingly unrelated decisions. Exposing the myths associated with ‘multilateralism’ might be an issue about which one would not want to compromise and a negative team might lose the opportunity to do so with any hint of support for UN peacekeeping operations. Each of these competitiveness standards might simply be better argued as an example of an opportunity cost.

• **Conditional/Dispositional/Provisional** – These terms refer to the circumstances by which a negative team may dispose of its own counterplan in a debate.

Conditional – This argument makes the claim that the negative team may abandon its counterplan at any point of a debate, for any reason (“Just call the whole thing off.”)

Dispositional – This argument makes the claim that the negative team may abandon the counterplan if the affirmative team has not captured it for their side in the debate (a so-called ‘straight turn.’)

Provisional – This argument makes the claim that the negative team may abandon a counterplan based on the circumstances of the debate.

The latter position is sensible; the former positions are more suspect. In the first case, a *conditional counterplan*, it seems entirely reasonable for the negative team to abandon any of its arguments in a debate. The negative side routinely abandons topicality arguments, disadvantages, critiques, and substantive arguments disputing the factual and reasoned positions of an affirmative case. Why not be permitted to abandon a counterplan? Perhaps it is the term itself – counterplan – that is the source of the problem. Because the term incorporates language that is at the core of the affirmative team’s argument in a debate (PLAN), and debaters and judges consistently acknowledge that it is almost always decisive and contrary to the affirmative teams’ interests for the affirmative team to abandon its plan, therefore, it must also be the case for a negative team’s counterplan. This seems to be premised on an erroneous understanding of the nature of proof and strategic roles of the debate teams. It simply does not follow and is contrary to other practice that the negative team cannot unconditionally abandon a counterplan in a debate.

In the second case, a dispositional counterplan, it seems theoretically reasonable (although, perhaps, unwise) for the negative team to abandon its counterplan, even if the affirmative team has turned it to its advantage. After all, this is simply another favorable argument for the affirmative team. Just as the negative is under no obligation to counter every favorable

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

argument introduced in a debate by the affirmative team, it should not be compelled to do so here. The negative ought to make tactical decisions as the debate develops, as should the affirmative team. Forced obligations to defend arguments, regardless of the changed circumstances of a debate, seem to have more to do with rulemaking than reasoned decision-making.

To consider counterplans as *provisional* makes sense. Like other arguments, a counterplan should be considered on its probative substance and should be included or excluded at the discretion of the side introducing it in the debate.

- **Significance** – A measure of import. Significance can be qualitative (to what degree) and/or quantitative (to how many).
- **Impact** – The evaluative consequence of an argument, as for the outcome of a debate. There are two elements of an argument impact (1) the measure of significance and (2) the role that a significant argument of its type will be a factor in the decision outcome of a debate. Needless to say, an argument with significance (300 people, loss of privacy, etc.) may not necessarily be a factor in the outcome of a debate. Significance is a necessary but not sufficient condition of an argument impact.
- **Nontopicality** – The theoretical requirement that a counterplan should not endorse the topic. In practice, an affirmative team's plan is the affirmative team's interpretation of the topic for the purpose of having a debate. Unless the negative side literally repeated the plan, there is no likelihood that a counterplan would be a reflection of the topic, as interpreted by the affirmative team in a debate.

There are additional theoretical and practical reasons to dispose of this issue: it misunderstands the strategic role of the negative and issues of proof in a debate; the theory is applied with considerably inconsistency (for example, other negative arguments are not tested in this manner; affirmative arguments, such as a turn of a negative position, are not tested in the same way, etc.) it presumes an interpretation of the topic distinct from the affirmative's interpretation, etc.) These issues are less important given that the affirmative team's interpretation of the topic as the plan forecloses the affirmative side's ability to genuinely argue this position against a counterplan, eliminating the need for a nontopical defense from the negative side.

Permutation – A test of the competitiveness of a counterplan. A permutation is an argument, initiated by the affirmative side, typically in the speech immediately following the negative speech introducing a counterplan in a debate. It is an argument explaining that the counterplan is not relevant to the debate, that it does not counter or undermine the affirmative team's position. The affirmative speaker suggests a hypothetical – a permutation – an imagined world in which the main features of the plan and the counterplan could be brought into existence. The speaker proposes that this imagined

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

world of the plan and the counterplan would be a better world, with even more benefits for all. If the speaker is correct, then the counterplan is not an opportunity cost at all. In fact, the counterplan would complement the affirmative plan, rather than undermine it.

In order for the negative team to succeed with a counterplan, it must be prepared to answer the anticipated affirmative permutation, “What if we could have both the plan and counterplan?” A formulation of this question, from the perspective of the negative team, is to prove that the counterplan (CP) is of greater value than the combination of the plan (P) and the counterplan (CP). [CP > P + CP] This is nothing more than a technical way of describing an opportunity cost. If the plan and counterplan complement each other, there is no lost opportunity, only more opportunities. The counterplan must be superior to the combination of the plan and counterplan (in debate jargon, “the counterplan is net beneficial to the perm”) to substantively demonstrate that it functions as a genuine opportunity cost. If the negative team is unable to prove that the counterplan reveals an opportunity cost, the counterplan does not actually ‘counter’ anything offered by the affirmative side in the debate; it is not relevant to the outcome of the contest and should not be considered by a judge.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Sample of counterplan suggestions from a high school debate institute, Summer 2004

- **Adjust Policy:** Here, the negative would become what has traditionally been called a minor repair. The negative would argue that we should revise existing foreign policy rather than establishing new policies.
- **Agency Counterplan:** Instead of Congress or the President acting, the Department of Defense or other federal agency would enact the plan. In addition to avoiding the political fallout from principle officials acting, these bodies may have superior expertise and a greater ability to adjust the rules if and when problems arise.
- **Courts Counterplan:** Instead of having Congress and the President act, the Supreme Court may be able to interpret laws in a way that forces the US to be more supportive of UN Peacekeeping Operations. This likelihood may be increased with pending action regarding the detaining of suspects in the War on Terror and other US actions in this presidency. Court action is net-beneficial because it avoids politics disadvantages.
- **NATO Counterplan:** The plan would be executed by NATO troops. This may allow the United States to take an active role without having been perceived as moving away from its unilateral approach on other issues.
- **Study Counterplan:** Rather than permanently establishing a policy, we should first study the affirmative proposal to determine if it is actually desirable before we lock ourselves into it.
- **Privatized Army Counterplan:** Instead of the United States acting toward the United Nations, the United States could take domestic action to allow privatized armies to serve the UN in various capacities.
- **OCHA Counterplan:** The Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs could be empowered in a counterplan that was primarily funding or humanitarian based. Many authors believe that the UN is under-utilizing this committee and its potential for success could increase the UN's international credibility and effectiveness.
- **Japan CP** Currently Japan is seeking "soft power" policies to increase its overall stature in and out of region. It has a peacekeeping division in its military (many are in Iraq in the status quo) and a strong economy in the event that the plan is financially based. A Japan counterplan could claim that increasing Japan's soft power will keep Asia stable.
- **EU Counterplan:** The European Union has been working toward a common defense system and a high profile peacekeeping mission could help establish them as a world player. It could also be used to counter back United States hegemony.
- **Consult EU Counterplan:** In the wake of the Iraq War, the United States is having to rebuild its relations with much of Europe. The EU is integral to developing a cohesive partnership with these nations. Additionally, their aspirations to become independent defensively makes them strong allies when it comes to supplying troops and funding in the future. It is also likely that consulting the EU will diminish the perception that the United States is bullying the United Nations.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY ON COUNTERPLAN THEORY

Branham, Robert J. "Roads Not Taken: Counterplans and Opportunity Costs." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (Spring, 1989): 246-255.

Herbeck, Dale, Katsulas, John, and Leeper, Karla. "A Permutation Standard of Competitiveness." *JAJFA* 22 (Summer, 1985): 12-19.

Lichtman, Allan J and Rohrer, Daniel M. "A General Theory of the Counterplan." *JAJFA* 12 (Fall, 1975): 70-79.

Panetta, Edward M. and Dolley, Steven. "The Topical Counterplan: A Competitive Policy Option." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 25 (Winter, 1989): 165-177.

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

APPENDIX 1

Exercise 1A.

Resolved: That the United States federal government should establish a foreign policy substantially increasing its support of the United Nations peacekeeping operations.

WDI 2004
Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

Exercise 1B.

SEARCH TERM: “ALTERNATIVES TO PEACEKEEPING”

Web

Results **1 - 10** of about **48,600** for **alternatives to peacekeeping**. (0.27 seconds)

Ingenta: article summary -- **Alternatives to peacekeeping** in Korea ...
... **Alternatives to peacekeeping** in Korea: The role of non-state actors and face-to-face encounters International **Peacekeeping** Spring 2004, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. ...
www.ingenta.com/isis/searching/Expand/
ingenta?pub=infobike://fcp/ip/2004/00000011/00000001/art00008 - Similar pages

Ingenta: Table of Contents -- International **Peacekeeping**, Spring ...
... 8. **Alternatives to peacekeeping** in Korea: The role of non-state actors and face-to-face encounters Bleiker R. International **Peacekeeping**, Spring 2004, vol. ...
www.ingenta.com/isis/browsing/TOC/ingenta?issue=pubinfobike://fcp/ip/2004/00000011/00000001 - 50k - Cached - Similar pages
[More results from www.ingenta.com/isis/browsing/TOC/ingenta?issue=pubinfobike://fcp]

Regional **Alternatives to UN Peacekeeping** Operations
Regional **Alternatives to UN Peacekeeping** Operations by Paul F. Diehl.
It is frequently suggested that the United Nations needs to ...
www.acdis.uiuc.edu/homepage_docs/pubs_docs/S&P_docs/S&P_VIII-2/regional_alternatives.html - 23k - Cached - Similar pages

Peacekeeping Under the Microscope - 9/21/00
... Join the discussion: Does **peacekeeping** work? Who should run it? Who should pay for it? Are there viable **alternatives to peacekeeping**? Join our Community! ...
globalization.about.com/library/weekly/aa092100a.htm - 19k - Cached - Similar pages

Debate Central - UN Peace Keeping: Rate this link: "The ...
Please rate the link The **Alternatives** To Neoconservatism Are Dangerously Insufficient between one and ten, with ten being tops. ...
www.debate-central.org/cgi-bin/links5/rate.cgi?ID=1344 - 10k - Cached - Similar pages

[PDF] Alternatives to Peacekeeping in Korea: The Role of Non-State ...
File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat
Alternatives to Peacekeeping in Korea: The Role of Non-State Actors and Face-to-Face Encounters ROLANDBLEIKER Korea is one of the world's most volatile areas ...
taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/index/CKXUUCHH373EVP1Q.pdf - Similar pages

PKI - Conference 2003
... Satellite Imagery Intelligence (IMINT) Sharing in Joint **Peacekeeping** Operations: Five **Alternatives** for Obtaining IMINT When the US Government Cannot Share or ...
www.carleton.ca/csds/pki/pki-conference.html - 39k - Cached - Similar pages

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

Policy Library | Humanitarian Intervention - State Sovereignty ...
... Denmark. Project on Defense **Alternatives** US Policy Library Member. ... **Peacekeeping**
and Related Operations US. Institute on Global Conflict and Resolution US.
www.policylibrary.com/humanitarianintervention/ - 58k - Cached - Similar pages

Humanitarian Training: Armed Conflict and **Peacekeeping**
... Regional **Alternatives** to UN **Peacekeeping**? Training for **Peacekeeping**. Week Five -
Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Political, Economic, Social, Security Challenges; ...
www.reliefweb.int/training/ti1310.html - 8k - Cached - Similar pages

IDRC Reports Archive: Preventive **Alternatives** to Conflict (October ...
Preventive **Alternatives** to Conflict by John Eberlee The international community
should place less emphasis on UN **peacekeeping** and more on development ...
archive.idrc.ca/books/reports/V223/prevent.html - 10k - Cached - Similar pages

©2004 Google

WDI 2004
Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

SEARCH TERM: "ALTERNATIVES TO UN PEACEKEEPING"

Web

Results 1 - 10 of about 37,800 for **alternatives to UN peacekeeping**. (0.38 seconds)

UN Peacekeeping Policy
Stanford Online Courses. Explore **UN peacekeeping** with leading experts.
scpd.stanford.edu

See your message here...

Regional Alternatives to UN Peacekeeping Operations

Regional Alternatives to UN Peacekeeping Operations by Paul F. Diehl. It is frequently suggested that the United Nations needs to ...
www.acdis.uiuc.edu/homepage_docs/pubs_docs/S&P_docs/S&P_VIII-2/regional_alternatives.html - 23k - Cached - Similar pages

Keeping the Peace—After A (UN) Fashion

... each one considers the background of the decision to employ **UN** forces, the **alternatives to UN** involvement, and the legal bases for the **peacekeeping** operations. ...
www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/aureview/1972/jan-feb/hitchens.html - 13k - Cached - Similar pages

UN Peacekeeping Seminar Readings

... Institutional **alternatives to traditional UN peacekeeping**: an assessment of regional and multinational options," *Armed Forces and Society*, 19(2): 209-230. 23. ...
www.maxwell.syr.edu/ir/globalprogramspages/readings-unpk.asp - 19k - Cached - Similar pages

University of Maryland University College

... of **peacekeeping**. The course will survey various operations, evaluate their success and forecast current trends. It will also focus on **alternatives to UN** ...
faculty.ed.umuc.edu/~jfreed/gvpt_1990.htm - 6k - Cached - Similar pages

IDRC Reports Archive: Preventive Alternatives to Conflict (October ...

Preventive Alternatives to Conflict by John Eberlee The international community should place less emphasis on **UN peacekeeping** and more on development ...
archive.idrc.ca/books/reports/V223/prevent.html - 10k - Cached - Similar pages

US Policy on UN Peacekeeping - Global Policy Forum - UN Security ...

... when it conceals important differences among fundamentally divergent **alternatives**. "**Peacekeeping**" has been traditionally understood in the **UN** context to mean ...
www.globalpolicy.org/security/peacekpg/us/bolton.htm - 16k - Cached - Similar pages

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

un peacekeeping in a post-cold war world

... of the **UN** system is called for, to integrate **UN peacekeeping** operations. ... Failure to use the **UN** in this fashion limits the **alternatives** available to these ...

www.ndu.edu/inss/McNair/mcnair26/m026ch01.html - 38k - Cached - Similar pages

CIVPOL Web Site - China sends police officer on **UN peacekeeping** ...

... us that men and nations behave wisely once they have exhausted all other **alternatives**. --. ... China sends police officer on **UN peacekeeping** mission to Afghanistan. ...

www.civpol.org/portal/html/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=425 - 39k - Cached - Similar pages

Chronology of Cambodian History

... We have considered carefully various **alternatives** for **UN** involvement which you ... for a resolution for either (a) **UN**-organized **peacekeeping** force of ...

www.geocities.com/khmerchronology/tele052564.htm - 14k - Cached - Similar pages

Humanitarian Training: Armed Conflict and **Peacekeeping**

... Regional **Alternatives** to **UN Peacekeeping**? Training for **Peacekeeping**. Week Five - Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Political, Economic, Social, Security Challenges; ...

www.reliefweb.int/training/ti1310.html - 8k - Cached - Similar pages

©2004 Google

WDI 2004

Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

SEARCH TERM: "US ALTERNATIVES TO UN PEACEKEEPING"

Web

Results 1 - 10 of about 38,300 for US alternatives to UN peacekeeping. (0.28 seconds)

UN Peacekeeping Policy

Stanford Online Courses. Explore UN **peacekeeping** with leading experts.
scpd.stanford.edu

Regional Alternatives to UN Peacekeeping Operations

Regional **Alternatives to UN Peacekeeping Operations** by ... faced difficulties in gaining **US** cooperation for a ... on international conflict, **UN peacekeeping**, and arms ...
www.acdis.uiuc.edu/homepage_docs/pubs_docs/S&P_docs/S&P_VIII-2/regional_alternatives.html - 23k -
Cached - Similar pages

Alternatives : Is the US Considering a Return to the UN ?

... In Action. **Alternatives'** projects in Quebec and in Canada. ... (There is a history of this kind of **US** control of **UN peacekeeping** operations through ...
www.alternatives.ca/article808.html - 48k - Jul 12, 2004 - Cached - Similar pages

US Policy on UN Peacekeeping - Global Policy Forum - UN Security ...

... that "**peacekeeping** can also serve **US** interests by ... it conceals important differences among fundamentally divergent **alternatives**. ... understood in the **UN** context to ...
www.globalpolicy.org/security/peacekpg/us/bolton.htm - 16k - Cached - Similar pages

US Embassy, Nigeria: Holbrooke Briefs US Senate on UN Peacekeeping ...

... some resistance, including from inside the **US** Mission ... decision -- after all, we pushed the **UN** to adopt ... We are also examining **alternatives** to help stabilize the ...
usembassy.state.gov/nigeria/wwwhcf35.html - 31k - Cached - Similar pages

Keeping the Peace—After A (UN) Fashion

... s Institute of War and Peace Studies but was Deputy **US** Air Force ... the background of the decision to employ **UN** forces, the **alternatives** to **UN** involvement, and ...
www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/aureview/1972/jan-feb/hitchens.html - 13k - Cached -
Similar pages

[PDF] UN PEACEKEEPING: Status of Long-standing Operations and US ...

File Format: PDF/Adobe Acrobat - View as HTML

... **US** officials told **us** that some of these operations probably would not have been initially approved under current **US** and **UN peacekeeping** policies. ...
www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO/NSIAD-97-59 - Similar pages

WDI 2004
Counterplanning Lesson Plan (Basic)

Wage-Peace.org - **Alternatives** to War

... **Alternatives** to destructive military force as a ... Who Torture and Kill for **Us** — Carl Estabrook. ... for creation of ICC, and **UN peacekeeping** involving disinterested ...
www.wage-peace.org/**alternatives**/index.php - 22k - Cached - Similar pages

US Department of State 95/08/11 Focus: **UN Peacekeeping**: Supporting ...

... While **UN peacekeeping** costs can and must be better ... choice than either of the **alternatives**: acting unilaterally ... spread to directly threaten **US** national security ...
dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/intlorg/fact_sheets/s2.html - 10k - Cached - Similar pages

Peacekeeping

... a senior fellow at the **US** Institute of Peace ... **UN** Peace-keeping Operations, Department of Public Information ... The Project on Defense **Alternatives**, The Commonwealth ...
www.library.yale.edu/**un/un3b7**.htm - 8k - Cached - Similar pages

UN Peacekeeping Seminar Readings

... Course 2, "War, National Policy & Strategy." Academic Year 1997 **US** Army War College ... Institutional **alternatives** to traditional **UN peacekeeping**: an assessment ...
www.maxwell.syr.edu/ir/ globalprogramspages/readings-**unpk**.asp - 19k - Cached - Similar pages

©2004 Google

Topicality

I. Debate is an activity primarily concerned with policy making. What is a good policy to fix the problem of X? How are we to determine what a good policy is as opposed to a bad one? This is where the resolution comes in –

A. The **Resolution** provides the focus for policy debate and it changes annually. Each year a topic area is decided upon and then a resolution is created in order to specify what issues will be of vital importance. The resolution is a statement, defended by the affirmative team, which tells both the affirmative and negative what the key items for a particular policy will or should be? The resolution identifies many things ...

- Relevant agents of policy (USFG/USFG-UN)
- Type of policy (UN PKO)
- Level of change required (substantially increase)
- Method that the affirmative should follow (PKO's through the UN)

* The resolution tells the affirmative what types of plans to write. Similarly, the resolution serves as a guide to negative teams by isolating an area or areas that they should research (all possible affirmative ground).

B. Traditional Standards in Debate- “Best Definition vs. Reasonability”

Debate has traditionally given the affirmative some flexibility to define the terms of the resolution; an oft quoted standard is that of “reasonability”. Is the affirmative representative of a reasonable ‘Reasonability’ is the framework in which discussions about topicality has been evaluated.

- Within this framework, much of topicality argument has been concerned with establishing standards for determining what definitions are reasonable. There are many standards that are employed in order to determine the best definition and/or interpretation.

- The major premise of the best definition principle is that even if the affirmative can meet its own "reasonable" definition of the resolution, it should still lose on topicality provided that the negative can offer a better definition of one or more of the resolution's terms which the affirmative fails to meet.

- Non-contextual Definitions - The sentiment favoring a best definition standard derives in large part from a feeling that topics have become too broad. A major argument against this approach is therefore an attempt to justify relatively broad topics. If broad topics are desirable, then presumably definitional standards become much more acceptable. Topic breadth can be defended on a number of grounds. First, from the standpoint of diversity, broader topics are arguably more interesting because they prevent excessively repetitive discussion of the same issues. Also, they raise a larger number of issues and require more

research and can be defended as more educational. It can be argued that broad topics don't have to produce bad debating. They might, promote quick thinking and improvisation by the negative. Furthermore, generic issues on a topic may well be the ones most worth discussing. Certainly, NATO versus the USFG or Canada versus USFG-UN Demining could be seen as a critical discussion. Thus, focus on generics need not be an evil.

C. Standards: A general argument that describes different types of definitions. Standards describe what kinds of definitions are best for debate.

It is important to note here that this list is by no means representative of all standards argued in debate. Additionally, standards (even really traditional ones) have and are questioned within the context of debate rounds frequently.

1. **Limits-** This argument proposes that words must be defined such that the scope of the resolution is limited, so that each word has a meaning that further limits the resolution. (According to Roger Solt) The intended result is that no word in the resolution is defined in a way that makes it redundant with another term or an already assumed debate burden so that contextual usages of the word (both grammatical and in the relevant policy or scholarly field) are respected, and so that adequate ground to oppose the resolution is maintained for the negative. The most commonly offered reason is in order to provide more limited topics. The premise of this argument is that topics have become overly broad, largely because reasonability is such an inherently vague concept. Especially if all definitions are accepted as reasonable which are not obviously absurd or irrational, then the affirmative has tremendous latitude in how it defines the resolution and in what case it selects. The result is extremely broad topics and a consequential distortion of the debate process. Faced with such a range of cases, it is argued, negatives are generally ill-prepared and forced to rely excessively on generic arguments. The result is both bad, less than educationally optimal debating and a competitive imbalance favoring the affirmative. Requiring the affirmative to meet the best definition standard narrows the range of cases, permitting more thorough negative preparation, encouraging better debate and greater competitive balance.

2. **Contextual Definitions** - The best definition standard promotes greater linguistic precision. Relying on loose, sub-optimal definitions, definitions that frequently distort or ignore the context of the resolution, promotes an habitual misuse of language. Given the importance of language both as a tool of policy analysis and of day-to-day living, such imprecision should be discouraged. The search for the best definition leads to interpretations of the terms of the topic which are analytically rigorous and contextually accurate. It can be argued thirdly that the resolution is a statement requiring interpretation, and that in any interpretive situation we should seek the most likely meaning of the statement being examined rather than contenting

ourselves with any possible meaning. Courts in interpreting a statute presumably attempt to determine what Congress actually meant, not what it could have meant.

3. **Bright Line** – Negative teams will argue that a definition that creates a clear distinction (bright line) between what is and what is not topical is best. These definitions are good because it decreases confusion and allows for depth in debate.

4. **Ground/Abuse** -

II. Making a Topicality Argument

*Topicality is about competing interpretations.

Topicality should be written before the debate round begins in order to save time. Most topicality arguments are set-up in a similar fashion.

- A. **Definition** – Answers the question, “What word(s) does the affirmative plan not meet?”

The definition is the first part of the topicality violation. It is evidence that defines one or more words within the resolution. These are the word(s) that the negative team will claim that the affirmative team does not meet or violates.

- B. **Violation** – Answers the question, “Why does the affirmative plan violate (the meaning of) a word in the resolution?”

The violation is an explanation of how the affirmative team violates the meaning of the word identified in the A sub point. In other words, this is where a team explains to the judge exactly why the affirmative plan is not an example of the type of action identified by the resolution.

- C. **Reasons to Prefer the Negative Definition or Standards** – Answers the question, “Why is my definition/interpretation better than the affirmative team’s?”

This section of a topicality argument will list arguments that explain why the negative interpretation of a particular word or words is superior to the interpretation of the affirmative team. Affirmative teams will always argue that their interpretation is fair, reasonable, etc. The ‘Standards’ debate is an important part of a topicality debate because it explains to the judge why she/he should prefer one team’s interpretation over the other. Until the 2AC has an opportunity to articulate their interpretation, the negative team will rely on the specifics of the plan text and what precedent that plan text sets up, i.e.: what other affirmatives would be topical based on the affirmatives plan.

- D. **Voting Issue** – Answers the question, “What should the judge do in order to teach the affirmative not to run non-topical cases?”

This section tells the judge that the affirmative team should lose and it provides reasons why. Two frequently heard reasons are **debatability** and **jurisdiction**.

1. **Jurisdiction** – The judge is only permitted to evaluate affirmative plans that can be found within the sphere of the resolution. If a plan isn't topical, a judge is not allowed to vote for it because the resolution gives the judge power only over certain issues each year.
2. **Debatability** – The idea that both the affirmative and negative team should have an equal or fair chance to debate and win. Since, the resolution serves to help both the affirmative and the negative, both teams should abide by it. If the affirmative can choose to discuss a different issue and the negative has the expectation of discussing only topical plans, the negative is at a distinct disadvantage.

III. Winning with Topicality

A. Negative Teams

In order to win T on the negative, you must prove:

1. The Negative Definition(s) are superior to the affirmative definition(s) and/or interpretation(s).
2. The Affirmative Plan does not fall within the resolution.

Topicality functions to limit what the affirmative is able to do in a given debate round. The resolution provides a barrier between what the affirmative is able to address and what the negative is able to do.

In addition to providing standards, a negative team should also use specific arguments that talk about the affirmative plan in relation to the topic or specific debate round. Specific arguments are important because they take the theory of topicality and illustrate how it should function in light of the year's resolution, topic, or a particular instance. There are an infinite number of specific arguments that a negative team can make.

Examples of Specific Arguments

- Grammar – Words are used as a noun and not a verb, Term of Art, etc

B. Affirmative Teams

Affirmative Topicality Tips

1. Memorize the resolution! You cannot know if you are topical if you do not know what the resolution says.

2. Research the words of the resolution. It is very difficult to know if your affirmative meets its resolitional burden unless you have a basic understanding of what the resolution requires from affirmatives this year.

3. Write your plan text carefully! Negative teams will look at your plan text in order to write their topicality arguments against your case. If your plan text is topical, it will make T debates a lot easier for you. Remember: Advantages cannot make you topical. Your plan text must be topical!!
4. Read a counter-definition that your affirmative meets and be sure to list some standards that prove your definition/interpretation is not abusive and a good standard for debate.
5. Argue against the definition and the standards/reasons to prefer given by the negative.
6. Argue against Topicality as a voting issue:
 - Language is indeterminate
 - Decreases education
 - Not real world
 - Leads to exclusion of important ideas