**Debate components**

**Outline of a first constructive speech (either aff or neg) in LD Value debate**

I) Open the speech

 A) Introduction (Use a quote from somebody, or tell a brief story) 15 – 30 seconds

 B) Overview 1 to 1.5 minutes

 1) Presentation of Resolution

 a. Statement of Resolution (this must be read verbatim)

 b. Definition of Terms

 2) Presentation and Explanation of standards of judgment

 a. Outline core values

 b. Explain the criteria by which the values are judged.

 3) **Signpost**

II) Develop arguments 1 minute each

 A) Contention 1

 B) Contention 2

 C) Contention 3

III) The Close 15 – 30 seconds

 A) Underview

 1) summary of contentions

 2) restatement of standards of judgment

 3) restatement of Resolution

 B) Conclusion

The introduction is the aff’s chance to grab the attention of the judge and establish reasons to vote for them. Use a story or analogy to relate the importance of the problem. The intro ends with a transition into the resolution.

The resolution is read, verbatim, exactly as it is written (that is an example of redundancy) Definition of terms is perhaps the single most important aspect of debate. Who controls the dictionary wins. Explain your core values in the resolution, the values you defend or attack. The value criteria are the how the values are weighted. Signpost arguments. That means present an outline of the speech you are about to read. This helps everyone keep track of the issues.

Example:

Resolved that capital punishment is justified in an open democracy

Suppose I am the aff. I need to defend capital pun. I am going to come out, tell a little story about someone suffering a hideous fate because of a repeat offender who should have been killed by the state long ago. We can prevent this from happening again! Read the resolution. We stand firmly in support of the resolution. Then I define the terms. Define capital pun, define justified. What are the values we are defending. You can advance S.O. and liberty. Signpost arguments. 1) Violation of social contract 2) death penalty deters future violence thereby protecting society 3) DP prevents recidivism and protects society.

**Signpost your signpost**

Cross Ex

* 1. don’t look at your opponent. Look at the judge. Look at the wall.
	2. Be polite. Firm, but polite
	3. Think before you speak
	4. When being questioned, don’t respond yes or no. Take as much time as you can to respond.
	5. If you are questioning don’t let the other guy ramble and eat your cross ex time. It is okay to interrupt a rambling response and repeat the question. It is also okay to interrupt and ask for a simple yes or no answer. It is also okay to interrupt with the observation that the witness is incapable or unwilling to answer the question and MOVE ON. Bring this up in a rebuttal. Don’t ask open ended questions – they invite filibuster,
	6. Try to know the answer to your question before you ask it. (except for points of clarification.
	7. Check their evidence
	8. Clarify arguments
	9. Expose errors in logic. If you find them, ask the other side to explain further in their next speech.
	10. Set up your arguments.

**Rebuttals**

Use to further attacks already made and defend opposition attacks on your positions. No new arguments may be introduced in rebuttals.

Use half of your rebuttal time for attack, and the other half for defense. Point out arguments that your opponent has dropped or responded to weakly. Finish with a summary of the core values and why you did a better job of defending those values than your opponent and ask the judge to vote for your side.

The neg cant just attack. They must also defend a specific position. They must make a case.

The neg rebuttal and conclusion are two speeches in one 7 minute block. Treat it as such.

Tips for things to do in rebuttal:

Find missing or weak links between value and arguments. If their examples don’t support their value, hold them accountable.

Expose unwarranted assumptions. If they present evidence, attack their evidence (poor methodology, biased sources) and present evidence of your own to counter.

Expose dropped arguments. An argument that the opposing team drops is won by you.

Avoid straw dogs. If the opposition claims that Cap Pun is justified in some cases, don’t pretend to misunderstand their position as that Cap Pun is justified in all cases, such as making an illegal left hand turn.

Question their logic. If Cap Pun deters murder, would it also deter theft? Would public torture deter murder? Is deterring murder really a standard of morality?

Attack absolute statements.