

## Overview of the Speeches

### **1AC – First Affirmative Constructive (8 minutes)**

The first affirmative’s job is to present a robust case for changing current policy. The affirmative case should satisfy what used to be called the “stock issues.” This includes: topicality, inherency, harms, a plan and solvency.

Topicality can be thought of as the basic parameters for the debate established by the resolution. This year the resolution is:

Resolved: That the United States federal government should establish an ocean policy substantially increasing protection of marine natural resources.

Inherency can be thought of as the status quo, or the current state of U.S. ocean policy. Here, the affirmative needs to prove that the plan it is proposing isn’t current policy.

Harms are the reasons why the status quo’s failure to act will have terrible consequences. In debate rounds these reasons are frequently described as advantages.

The plan is the affirmatives suggested course of action for what should be done. You may think of it as a piece of legislation which outlines what ought to be done.

Solvency is the claim made by the affirmative team that the plan which it endorses will solve the harms caused by the status quo.

### **1NC – First Negative Constructive (8 minutes)**

The first negative’s job is to sketch in broad terms all of the arguments which the negative team will use during the debate. The negative’s strategic arsenal might include such arguments as:

- Inherency arguments: The affirmative plan is already being done (since most affirmatives won’t choose non-inherent plans, you are unlikely to use this argument very much if ever).
- Status quo solves: Current policies will solve the harm(s) identified by the affirmative.
- Harms takeouts: There is no problem in the status quo.
- Harms turns: The harm or impact specified by the affirmative is actually good or desirable.
- Solvency takeouts: The affirmative plan won’t solve the problem.
- Solvency turns: The affirmative plan will make the problem worse.

- Disadvantages: The affirmative plan will result in disadvantages.
- Counterplan: A difference course of action is preferable to the one advocated by the affirmative.
- Kritiks: Either the language or one or more assumptions made by the affirmative is bad.
- Topicality: The affirmative plan is not among the list of cases identified by the resolution.

### **2AC – Second Affirmative Constructive (8 minutes)**

The second affirmative speaker is required to answer all of the arguments made by the negative. To do this, the 2AC should utilize the arguments presented in the 1AC and make new arguments as necessary.

### **The Negative Block - 2NC – Second Negative Constructive (8 minutes) and 1NR – First Negative Rebuttal (5 minutes)**

In the negative block the first and second negative debaters divide up the arguments which they made in the first negative speech and attempt to refute the affirmatives arguments and offer a more robust and detailed presentation of their arguments.

### **1AR – First Affirmative Rebuttal (5 minutes)**

The 1AR is charged with answering all of the arguments developed by the negative team in the block. Generally, the 1AR should not make new arguments, but should instead rely upon developing arguments which were in the 2AC. Of course, if the negative made some new arguments in the block, the 1AR will have to make “new” arguments to respond.

### **2NR – Second Negative Rebuttal (5 minutes)**

The 2NR is charged with selecting arguments from its arsenal which fit together to provide a compelling case that the affirmative plan is not desirable. Especially important here is weighing and assessing arguments. The goal of this speech is to piece together a coherent set of reasons why the negative should win the debate.

### **2AR – Second Affirmative Rebuttal (5 minutes)**

The 2AR is charged with answering the negative’s reasons why the affirmative plan should be rejected and refocusing the discussion on the reasons why the affirmative plan is desirable. Especially important here is weighing and assessing arguments. The goal of this speech is to piece together a coherent set of reasons why the affirmative should win the debate.