

- Whether the second speakers responded effectively to the criticisms of the first speakers.
- Whether the second speeches were consistent with what had already been said on that side; if not, how could these speeches have been improved?
- Whether you think the adjudicator now has a clear idea of the concept she is being asked to accept or reject.
- The extent to which the two cases clashed.

After you've watched the debate, discuss your findings in small groups.

CHAPTER CHECKLIST

- Except in the Karl Popper format, middle speakers do the bulk of the arguing. They present the majority of the arguments, rebut the opposition, identify the areas of clash, and prepare the case to hand over to the final speaker.
 - The first and second speeches combine to present the substantive case for a side and, as part of that, address concerns that may be in the mind of the adjudicator, whether they have been put there as a result of rebuttal or not.
 - Middle speakers must leave the case essentially complete, with no questions remaining.
 - In the Karl Popper format, second speeches are rebuttal speeches.
 - Second speakers in BP must not only offer argumentation but also offer a mini-conclusion in their speech.
 - The Third Affirmative speaker (Member of the Government) in BP must offer an extension—a new argument for adopting the proposal. The Third Negative speaker responds to this.
-