

# A Map of Debate Speeches: The Constructives

IAC	INC	2AC	2NC
<p><b>Significance/Harm</b> There is or there will be a significant problem.</p> <p><b>Inherency</b> The present course of action is insufficient to cope with this problem. Absent preventative or corrective action, the problem will continue to occur.</p> <p><b>Plan</b> A specific proposal to change the present system in order to solve the problem. The plan must be an example of the sort of action called for by the resolution.</p> <p><b>Solvency</b> The plan is sufficient to solve the problem, or at least to mitigate it to some significant degree.</p> <p><b>The IAC Structure</b> There are 2 basic types:</p> <p>I-Significance/Harm II-Inherency PLAN III-Solvency</p> <p>or</p> <p>I-Description of Status Quo PLAN Advantage 1 A) Significance/Harm B) Inherency C) Solvency Advantage 2 (&amp; so on) Same general structure as Advantage 1</p> <p>Debaters are creative, so don't be surprised by strange case structures.</p>	<p><b>"Case" Arguments</b> The negative may argue that part of the affirmative case is incorrect—there is no problem, the present system is sufficient to cope with the problem, or the plan is insufficient to cope with the problem in a significant way. The negative may also argue that any argument made by the affirmative is not only incorrect, but is actually the <i>opposite</i> of the truth.</p> <p><b>Topicality (T)</b> The plan is not an example of the sort of action called for by the resolution.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages (DAs)</b> The plan causes undesirable side-effects, not necessarily related to the resolution or the case. A) Brink/Uniqueness B) Link C) Impact The negative argues that the bad effects of the plan outweigh whatever advantage(s) the affirmative claims.</p> <p><b>Counterplans</b> A <i>Negative</i> proposal for action to solve the problem identified in the IAC. These proposals are different from the plan and can be non-topical. Another requirement for counterplans is that they demonstrate some reason why the case is a bad idea—"competitiveness."</p> <p><b>Critiques</b> The negative may argue that the plan should be rejected because the basic assumptions of the affirmative are bad or it uses bad language or ideas.</p>	<p><b>Answering the Negative</b> The 2AC attempts to answer the arguments made by the INC, but it is <i>also</i> the job of the 2AC to pre-empt the arguments that will be made by <i>both</i> of the next two negative speakers. The 2AC must therefore make much more extensive arguments in certain areas than the INC. This is a definite disadvantage strategically, as the arguments made by the 2AC must be good enough to withstand the entire block of negative attacks.</p> <p><b>Using the IAC</b> Most 2AC's will attempt to use arguments and evidence which have been forwarded in the IAC to answer arguments made in the INC. Affirmatives write their first constructive speeches not only to make their case to the judge, but also to provide themselves with arguments that will be usable by the 2AC.</p> <p>This is the last speech in which affirmatives are usually allowed to make new arguments.</p>	<p><b>Extending PART of the INC</b> The 2NC must choose some (but NOT ALL) of the arguments made by the INC to extend. The 2N and the IN must communicate with each other to make sure that they are not trying to extend the same arguments.</p> <p>Most of the 2NC will be spent extending and expanding on arguments made in the INC. The 2NC must also answer the arguments made by the 2AC. The negative arguments may change substantially from their original form during this speech.</p> <p>There is no requirement that the 2NC cover particular arguments, but many 2NC's like to cover plan arguments, especially disadvantages.</p> <p><b>New Arguments</b> It is not common, but 2NC's will sometimes make completely new arguments. Even when the 2NC does not make a <i>completely</i> new argument, there will often be new links, impacts, or specific case or counterplan arguments. The IAR can respond freely to both kinds of new arguments.</p>

# The Rebuttals

1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
<p><b>Extending OTHER INC Arguments</b></p> <p>In many ways, the 1NR is like having several more minutes of 2NC. This is the second speech in what is called the "negative block." Because the 2NC and the 1NR are like two parts of the same speech, the 1NR must be careful to extend <i>different</i> but <i>complementary</i> arguments from the 2NC. For example, if the 2NC extends disadvantages, the 1NR might extend arguments against the affirmative case.</p> <p>Unlike the 2NC, the 1NR is <i>not</i> allowed to make new arguments unless they are in response to arguments made by the 2AC.</p> <p><b>Pick and Choose</b></p> <p>There is no requirement that the 2NC and the 1NR extend ALL of the arguments made by the 1NC. Most negatives pick and choose their best arguments. However, the affirmative can extend arguments made in the 2AC that aren't answered by the negative block, so BE CAREFUL! If the negative does not extend a disadvantage that the affirmative has "turned," the affirmative is free to claim that disadvantage as an affirmative advantage.</p>	<p><b>The Hardest Speech in the Debate (maybe)</b></p> <p>The 1AR must respond to BOTH the 2NC AND the 1NR in a very small period of time. This means that most 1AR's tend to be fast and at least somewhat confusing. This is the speech in which the affirmative begins to select the issues on which they will base the debate.</p> <p>Good 1AR's will make these issues clear to the judge while still giving the 2AR plenty of options.</p> <p><b>Don't Forget Your Previous Speeches</b></p> <p>The 1AR must answer the arguments made by the 2NC and the 1NR, but don't forget to extend the arguments made in the 2AC. Even though it may seem like the 1AC was a long time ago, remember to extend your "case" arguments as well.</p>	<p><b>Overcoming the Presumption of the 2AR</b></p> <p>True, the 1AR has more speech time to cover, but the 2NR has to be so persuasive that the judge remembers his or her arguments even after the 2AR is over. The 2NR must make sense out of the 1AR and refute those arguments in a clear and conclusive fashion.</p> <p>At the end of a good 2NR, the judge should understand the fundamental negative position in the debate as well as the reasons the negative feels it should win the round.</p> <p><b>Telling the Story</b></p> <p>Given the number of arguments in the round, it is easy to get bogged down. Make sure to put all the arguments together into a "story"—an explanation of which issues (such as disadvantages and case arguments) the negative is winning and why those issues are more important than any arguments the affirmative might be winning. This story is usually told at the beginning of the 2NR as an "overview." The overview should be short but comprehensive.</p>	<p><b>The Final Word</b></p> <p>The 2AR is probably the most powerful speech in the round because there can be no response to the arguments made in it. The 2AR usually walks a fine line between extending the arguments made by his or her partner and making arguments which have not been made before in the debate. Because new arguments are not allowed in most rebuttal speeches, it is important to stay on the right side of the line!</p> <p><b>Telling the Story</b></p> <p>A good 2AR traces the affirmative line of argumentation from the 1AC to the final speech, making the judge understand why, in light of the arguments made in the 2NR, the affirmative should still win the round. As with the 2NR, this "story" usually appears in the form of an overview to the speech.</p>