

• **COMMENTARY: THE SECOND NEGATIVE SPEECH**

As we noted in Chapter 7, the negative speaker has many tasks in this section of the debate. For one, the negative speaker must continue to refute the affirmative case and highlight for the audience which parts of the first refutation have not been rebutted by the affirmative. Unanswered challenges should be repeated and reinforced. Answered challenges, however, do not need to be dropped: the negative can show how the affirmative rebuttal has been inadequate. And, of course, the negative speaker must defend the negative case against the refutations made by the affirmative in its last speech.

Alex does a fine job of both answering the affirmative's arguments and extending the negative's position. The first affirmative attack is that national action will fail. Alex responds that this is why the negative recommends giving countries assistance so they can solve their own problems.

22

The affirmative has argued that the ICC is the best solution to the problem of human trafficking. Alex extends the arguments of his partners that the ICC is a problem. He contends that the ICC will be abusive and corrupt because no checks on judges will be available and, in addition, no provisions are in place to ensure an equal voice among signatory states. Although Alex still provides no evidence for these arguments, the fact that the affirmative remains largely silent about these issues and that the arguments make sense, heightens their persuasive appeal.

23

Alex also reiterates that infringing on sovereignty risks war. However, here again, he provides no evidence. In fact, to this point, the negative team has yet to provide a shred of evidence to support these claims (a point, by the way, the affirmative should be making).

24

Finally Alex summarizes both positions and asserts that the negative's stance is better because it will not jeopardize sovereignty. In this way, he portrays negative's proposal as a no-lose situation.

25