

- *First Opposition.* The First Opposition should divide his speech equally between reacting to the First Proposition and introducing the Opposition case. Assuming there are no problems with the definition (there virtually never are), First Opposition sets out his side's principal objections to the Proposition's case. He outlines his team's overall direction of rebuttal—insofar as this is possible—and directly rebuts the argument put forward by the First Proposition. He indicates how his side will divide addressing the case and then moves into his main area of argument.
- *Second Proposition.* Second Proposition rebuts the arguments extended so far by the Opposition and defends what First Proposition said against the attacks raised against it. Usually a speaker will expect to spend roughly one-quarter to one-third of her speech roadmapping her remarks and dealing with those of the previous speaker, so Second Proposition should leave herself around four or five minutes to set out her arguments in detail.
- *Second Opposition.* If Opposition is developing its own case, Second Opposition would normally spend five-to-six minutes responding to the Proposition's case so far and defending First Opposition. He would then turn to his own case. If his speech is grounded entirely in rebuttal, he would pick up on those themes introduced by First Opposition and expand on them in the light of the comments made by Second Proposition.
- *Third Proposition and Opposition Speeches.* Generally, the vast bulk of these speeches will be spent attacking the arguments of the other side. This should, however, be done in the context of what has been said on the speaker's own side. Remember, this is not just an exercise in demonstrating that the other side is wrong but that the perspective put forward by the speaker's own side makes more sense or is more reasonable and attractive than the interpretation of the world offered by the other team. If necessary, both speakers can deal with a small part of their side's case, but, in practice, this should be seen as a tidying up exercise rather than as a required part of these speeches.
- *Reply Speeches.* Reply speakers do not introduce new material. Instead, they draw on the overarching themes of the debate to explain why their side's interpretation of the world is considered more accurate and why their view of how the world could be is preferable—or at least more likely. Reply speaking is all about the impression it leaves with the adjudicators. Speakers hope to leave a clear impression that their perspective is both reasonable and positive. They should provide the adjudicators with an easy means of interpreting the debate as a whole and invite them to take advantage of that interpretation.