

her arguments, elaborate, and expand on them as necessary, they may not introduce new arguments. She also defines any complex issues and criteria that her side will rely on throughout the debate. For example, if her side is using one specific aspect of a concept that is generally considered more broadly, she must state and define this. Her definition will stand for the remainder of her team's case; later speakers will not be able to reorient the concepts to their subsequent advantage.

- *First Negative Speaker.* The role of this speaker is to react to the arguments presented by the First Affirmative. He has the opportunity to challenge the definition, although this should only happen in exceptional circumstances, and also any criteria that the Affirmative team has introduced. If he does not challenge them, they are considered to have been accepted by his side. Similarly, First Negative identifies and challenges all of the Affirmative arguments that his team plans to contest; if he does not do so, those arguments are considered to have been accepted. In this format, the Negative does not have to present its own substantive policy.
- *Second Affirmative Speaker.* The Second Affirmative both attacks the constructive arguments put forward by First Negative and defends the arguments advanced by his colleague. If he does not challenge a constructive argument put forward by First Negative, that argument is considered to have been accepted; if he does not challenge a criticism, it is deemed to have been accepted. Consequently, he must be specific about the arguments that he is addressing. He is free to introduce new evidence—indeed, the format encourages this—to demonstrate why the First Negative's criticisms are not as strong as they may have appeared. He also points out to the adjudicator any arguments that First Negative conceded.
- *Second Negative Speaker.* In large part, this speech is the inverse of Second Affirmative's speech—exactly the same twin-track approach but criticizing both the refutation and the constructive evidence that has been presented by her opposite number. Both second speakers should be conscious that through the effective use of evidence-based refutation, they can begin to raise doubts in the mind of the adjudicator about the validity of research cited by the other side. This is where solid preparation pays off. If one team uses new evidence to respond to changes in the debate as they come up and the other is stretching the same evidence ever-thinner to cover the cracks in their responses, that begins to build up an impression of authority on one hand and desperation on the other.
- *Third Affirmative Speaker.* In this speech, the speaker's role is reactive: she responds to any new material that the Second Negative introduced. She may also offer new evidence in defense of the Affirmative case, but this is a summary speech, not a rebuttal in the manner of the debate's middle speakers. At this point, the speaker works to