

- All speakers should demonstrate that they are aware of the case put forward by the other side through direct reference to speakers and the substance of their arguments as well as through rebuttal.

Of course, it can be tempting to address the debate you hoped the other side would put forward—or the one you would have put forward in their position. Sadly, this is a surefire way of ensuring your defeat. In all normal circumstances, the adjudicator will judge you on the way you interact with the debate that is actually happening and not with some hypothetical construct of your own imagining. Thus, the debater will need not only to address the weaknesses in the opposing case but, ideally, demonstrate how disagreeing with that position and agreeing with her own are two sides of the same coin. She may wish to present herself as a reasonable person who admires the goals of her opponents but considers their proposal naïve or fantastical. Alternatively, she may criticize the arguments put forward by the other side as failing to address the key concerns at the heart of the debate, which, she will suggest, have been admirably and thoroughly dealt with by her and her colleagues. Possibly she will conclude, reluctantly, that the world the other team is asking you to accept is dangerous and that following their proposed route would be ruinous to wider society or would imperil the security of the nation.

The exact details of how she interacts with the opposing team's case will, inevitably, vary depending on the nature of their arguments. However, the broad idea that she is both promoting her perspective and rejecting that suggested by the other side holds true for all situations. Victory comes from persuading the adjudicator that accepting one means rejecting the other—and that doing so is the only reasonable position.

INDIVIDUAL SPEECHES

Viewing the debate from the perspective of the adjudicator, the wise speaker does not ask herself, "Was my speech good or bad?" rather, she asks, "Was my speech better or worse than the rest?"

What are the hallmarks of a "better" speech? How can the speaker put herself in a position to most influence an adjudicator? With all probability, a "better" speech will fulfill the following goals:

- bring clarity to the debate as a whole
- fit smoothly into the rest of the debate
- allow the adjudicator to move comfortably from neutral ground to the speaker's side of the debate