

have in mind and, conversely, the possible pitfalls that a respondent would do well to be aware of and avoid.

- *Soliciting information/seeking clarification.* This is the most basic reason for asking a question. Before you ask the question, consider who benefits by the opposing side's case being clearer. Sometimes the question helps them more than you, but usually it will just make the debate move more smoothly. Usually, you will be seeking information that you will use at a later stage of the debate. In the case of CX, a request for information or clarification may also form the starting point for a prolonged series of questions. Sometimes you might raise a question to which you already know the answer just to lodge the point firmly in the mind of the adjudicator. There are also times when asking for information or clarification is not strategic; you simply need the information. That's fine. There's no point in rushing off attacking a point only to discover that it wasn't what was said in the first place. Regardless of the reason for asking the question, you should have a goal in mind.

This type of question is also used for POIs to clarify a definition that is unclear, long-winded, or late to arrive.

- *Forcing a commitment to a point.* Before rebutting a point, it can be useful to have an opposing speaker commit to it. "Can I just confirm that you are arguing that flying pigs will provide a carbon neutral alternative to air flights? Is that correct?"

You should be aware that asking a question like this might encourage the respondent to tidy up his position rather than just confirm it, but, in the case of the flying pigs, he could only clarify so far. More probably, he has made a step that has strained logic beyond breaking point ("Can I just confirm that you are suggesting that the importation of Big Macs by Iran will lead directly to the fall of the regime?")

The most common form of this type of question, however, is to push for details, to find out how a certain claim might work, or to demand that an opposing speaker quantify a particular claim. "You said that you would use increased taxation to fund this proposal. Which tax and how much of an increase?"

- *Challenging credibility.* Knowledge-based questions, in particular, can be used to both challenge the credibility of an opponent's argument and endorse that of the person asking the question. Once again, remember that the target of the question is the adjudicator rather than your opponent. It is also worth repeating that once you've demonstrated that you know something your opponent doesn't, there's no need to hammer the point home. Questions of this kind would take the form of "Are you aware that report was subsequently withdrawn?" or "Are you aware that the resolution you