

presented. And, you must never ignore their arguments when they're under criticism. Obviously your approach will be slightly different when there is more than one team on each side. In such an instance, you should avoid directly criticizing members of the other team, but you aren't required to go to superhuman lengths to defend what they've said.

4. *Don't contradict one another.* Arguments that support one another are vital to the success of any case. All of your arguments may have the same destination but, for example, if the methodologies you set out in different parts of the case are mutually exclusive or if some implication of one argument would, in practice, undermine another, then you have a serious problem. The other side of the debate will probably pick up on the contradiction and, even if they don't, the adjudicator should. Avoid presenting arguments that are mutually exclusive or contradictory. In part, this is about good planning, and you should consider this issue during preparation time. However, it's easy to get flustered and say something without thinking in response to a question. Take your time before responding to a point of information or under cross-examination. There's nothing like actually considering your answer to make it look as though you've considered your answer, so you lose nothing by taking a second or two before you speak.

Interaction

As we have learned, presenting a brilliant case is not necessarily enough to win. The adjudicator is looking to see how teams interact with each other—how they clash. This means that:

- First Negative cannot address the debate she was hoping for but must deal with the debate as defined by First Affirmative.
- Speakers on both sides should tackle the points made by the speaker who immediately precedes them.
- All speakers should seek to demonstrate that observable or predictable events are more accurately explained by their own analysis and that of their colleagues than by the opposing side's.
- Affirmative speakers should address the case put forward by Negative speakers—whether that is an alternative model to achieve the same ends or a critique of purported inadequacies in their own case.