

The Negative (Opposition) in Parliamentary Debate

Prepared by Kasey Gardner, San Joaquin Delta College, Norcal Debate Camp, DVC, Fall 2009

Overview: Being negative in Parliamentary Debate is a game that involves research, prediction, preparation and quick execution. Analogy: 3rd Baseman to a Line Drive.

Section One: The Theory

1) Postulate One: Debate exists as a way to determine whether the resolution is true or desirable.

2) Postulate Two: At the beginning of the round the resolution is not true. This belief is called presumption; it is why the Proposition speaks 1st and last.

3) Conclusion: You can show the resolution is true by claiming the evidence brought into the debate by the Proposition does not represent the resolution, or that that evidence is inaccurate or leads to false conclusions.

Elements of Affirmative Cases Review

<u>Fact</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Policy</u>
Definitions	Definitions	Stock Issues
Case	Criteria	- Topicality
	Case	-
Significance/Harms		- Inherency
		- Solvency
		- Disadvantages

Section Two: Discussion

How might these factors be attacked in the following resolutions?

Resolution One: The 2003 Iraq War was an Act of Self Defense

Resolution Two: California is the best state in the United States

Resolution Three: The United States should balance the federal budget.

Section Three: In Practice

There are two fundamental practical processes involved in going negative that you must master. Modified Toulmin Model of Argumentation, and Steps of Refutation.

Modified Toulmin Model – All arguments are presented in the Format of Claim, Warrant and Evidence. Build an argument for attending community college on your own before you flip the page. Then compare argument

structures with the model.

Model Argument in Modified Toulmin Format

Claim – Students considering attending college should complete general education at a community college first.

Warrant – The cost is lower and it gives students a chance to see if attending college is right for them.

Evidence - \$26 dollars a unit is woefully cheaper than any other source of non-compulsory education and while not all students succeed in transferring the statistics that indicate those who do succeed.

Steps of Refutation (SOR) – This format of refuting arguments in debate will allow audiences and teams to keep track of your objections in an organized format while giving you a chance to explain the importance of every argument.

- 1) Identify the Argument “On their first Harm”
- 2) Give Responses (numbering if you have more than one) “My first argument is
- 3) Give the impact of the Responses “Without a reason to change, ignore plan”

Section Four: Structural Appendix

This section exists to be used as reference guide for structuring common off case negative positions. Keep it as a guide for consultation during prep time at tournaments and practice.

Topicality/Spec Counterplan	Disadvantage	Kritik
A. Interpretation A. Text	A. Uniqueness	A. Framework
B. Violation B. Comp	B. Link	B. Link
C. Standards C. Solvency	C. Internal Link	C. Impacts
D. Voters	D. Impacts	D. Alternative/ Voters

Group Exercises and Practicum, Opp in Parli Debate

Prepared by Kasey Gardner, San Joaquin Delta College, Norcal Debate
Camp, DVC, Fall 2009

Practicum One: Preparation (30 Mins)

In this exercise you will be given a resolution. You have to (1) identify what type of resolution it is and (2) prepare several negative arguments against it. You will be given 7 mins to prepare, 3 minutes to debrief as a group.

Resolution One:

Resolution Two:

Resolution Three:

