

# Opposition Strategy

NCFA Rookie Debate Camp

# Agenda

- ❖ A Brief Word on Trichotomy
- ❖ Basic Path to Winning
- ❖ Opposition Strategies by Position\*
- ❖ Quick Overview of Refutation Strength
- ❖ Specific OPP Arguments
- ❖ Activity

# Trichotomy

- ❖ Different kinds of resolutions call for different kinds of debate
  - ❖ Policy resolution\*
  - ❖ Value resolution
  - ❖ Fact resolution

# Basic Path to Winning

- ❖ GOV is limited by the resolution.
- ❖ OPP has almost infinite options to argue. To win, OPP needs to prove one or more of the following:
  - ❖ Status Quo (SQ) works; there is no need for plan
  - ❖ SQ may be bad, but passing plan is worse
  - ❖ SQ is bad, plan is OK, but OPP can solve better

# OPP Strategy by Position\*

- ❖ \* Judge preferences, differing debate arguments/theories, regional preferences make blanket strategies impossible.
- ❖ View the following as general guidelines/tips, not set in stone prescriptions

# Leader of OPP Constructive (8 minutes)

- ❖ Make the general position of OPP known. Which of the 3 ways of winning is OPP going for?
  - a. SQ works; there is no need for plan (case attacks)
  - b. SQ may be bad, but passing plan is worse (off case attacks)
  - c. SQ is bad, plan is OK, but OPP can solve better (counter- plan)
- ❖ Go for quantity of arguments in the LOC, MOC can give depth.

# Member of OPP

## Constructive (8 minutes)

- ❖ Although this is a Constructive speech and you are technically allowed to make new arguments here, it is not advised that you change strategies (like abandoning b for c).
  - a. SQ works; there is no need for plan (case attacks)
  - b. SQ may be bad, but passing plan is worse (off case attacks)
  - c. SQ is bad, plan is OK, but OPP can solve better (counter-plan)
- ❖ This is frequently the turning point of the debate

# MOC (cont.)

- ❖ First, MO should answer all arguments made by GOV
  - ❖ You can group similar arguments, but make sure to address all the claims.
  - ❖ Answer arguments, NOT examples
- ❖ Second, MO should continue to reinforce/extend OPP strategy (a, b, and/or c type arguments)

# Leader of OPP Rebuttal

(4 minutes)

(4 minutes)

- ❖ Because MO has answered all GOV arguments and extended all OPP arguments, do NOT do a line by line (reiterating the same things your partner just did)
- ❖ If MO did miss an argument, address it quickly
- ❖ Ideally, LOR will start with an Overview (summary) of the entire debate including your overall strategy (a, b and/or c)
- ❖ “GOV has presented a case that is worse than the current system (a) and does not fix the problem. As a judge, you should weigh the advantages and disadvantages to see which team is the best option. OPP has shown that GOV plan results in an economic disadvantage, harms relations with China, and does not solve any of the harms. For these reasons, we should win the round. Now let me give you specific voters.”

# LOR (cont.)

- ❖ Voters - debate point scoring system; however, it's not about we have 3 voters and they have 2 voters, so we win.
- ❖ You need to create (for the judge) what the world will look like if the judge votes OPP vs. if the judge votes GOV

# Refutation Review

- ❖ Argument: Capital punishment deters crime.

TYPE	REFUTATION	HOW TO USE	RESULT	STRENGTH
defense	counter-claim	Capital punishment does NOT deter crime.	none	super weak
defense	nit-pick	You have no proof.	none unless “dropped”	weak
defense	mitigate	There’s evidence for and evidence against, so we can’t be certain.	possibly neutralizes argument	okay

# Refutation Review

- ❖ Argument: Capital punishment deters crime.

TYPE	REFUTATION	HOW TO USE	RESULT	STRENGTH
defense	take-out	Criminals are not rational and evidence shows that there is no deterrent effect.	neutralizes argument	good
offense	turn	Capital punishment increases crime. Evidence shows that when murders are witnessed, murderers will kill witnesses to avoid death penalty. Capital punishment creates incentives to “finish the job.”	takes out the argument <b>AND</b> turns it on the opponent for damage	strong

# Specific OPP Arguments by Strategy by Strategy

- ❖ Reminder of the Basic Strategies
  - a. SQ works; there is no need for plan (case attacks)
  - b. SQ may be bad, but passing plan is worse (off case attacks)
  - c. SQ is bad, plan is OK, but OPP can solve better (counter- plan)

# Case Attacks (SQ Works)

- To prove SQ works, you can refute (attack) Harms and/or Solvency Arguments.
- Basic logic is that policies (laws) are enacted as solutions to problems. If there are no problems, then we shouldn't spend the resources to do anything and/or if the law won't solve the problem, then we shouldn't do anything.

# Case Attacks (cont.)

- ❖ Attack Harms/Significance:
  - ❖ Impact take out - the problem is not a problem
  - ❖ Impact turn - the problem is actually good
- ❖ Attack Solvency
  - ❖ Solvency take out - the plan does not solve
  - ❖ Solvency turn - the plan makes the problem worse

# Plan is Worse (DA)

- You agree with GOV that SQ is bad, but know that plan will make it WAY worse.
- Basic logic is that some times shoddy policies get passed due to exigence of the problems in the SQ. OPP wants to prevent short-sighted thinking and bad policy making

# Disadvantages (DA - cont.)

- ❖ Disadvantage: Tagline (name of argument)
- ❖ Link: how plan links into the disadvantage
- ❖ Brink: how SQ is already on the brink of impacts
- ❖ Uniqueness: isolates plan as the only variable that will cause the impacts
- ❖ Internal link: all the steps that logically connects plan to impacts and ultimately terminal impact
- ❖ Impacts: the horrors of passing plan

# OPP Can Do Better (CP)

- You agree with GOV that SQ is bad, but have a better way to solve the harms in the SQ.
- Basic logic is that there are multiple ways to solve a problem, some better than others and OPP has a better way to solve (unhampered by resolution)

# Counterplan (CP - cont.)

- ❖ Run like Plan (agent, mandate, timeline, funding, enforcement, etc.)
- ❖ You do need harms, impacts, solvency, etc., but strategically to save time, you should absorb GOV harms and impacts and just have different solvency
- ❖ It's not enough to propose a different way to solve. Ideally, CP + DA = win!
- ❖ Logic: GOV plan has a ton of horrible disadvantages. OPP's counterplan solves the same harms and avoids all the disadvantages

# Other OPP Arguments

- ❖ Topicality
- ❖ Kritik

# Topicality

- ❖ Plan is not “topical” (on topic with the resolution)
- ❖ Example
  - ❖ Plan = USFG will stop Saturday delivery
  - ❖ Res = USFG should disband the post office
  - ❖ disband = break up and stop functioning as an organization (dictionary.com)
  - ❖ Stopping Saturday delivery doesn't = Disband

# Topicality Structure

- ❖ Topicality on the word:
- ❖ Violation:
- ❖ Standards:
  - ❖ Best definition, Reasonable, Predictable, Precision, Grammar, Field Context, Brightline, Limit, etc.
- ❖ Counter-definition: better definition
- ❖ Reason(s) to prefer counter-definition: explain how your counter-definition better meets the standards
- ❖ Voting issue: why Topicality matters to debate round (not content)
  - ❖ Jurisdiction, Framers' Intent, Fairness, Tradition
  - ❖ A priori