



Whip Speeches



Content

This seminar will cover:

- What are the goals of a Whip Speech? (Clue: winning the debate)
- How to rebuild, rebut, frame, weigh, and compare from Whip
- How you can structure your Whip Speech
- How to prepare for your Whip Speech
- How to work strategically from Whip
- Two training exercises to help practices specific skills relevant to Whip Speeches

What is a Whip Speech?

What is a strategic choice in debating?

- **Debating is time limited:** strategic decisions are decisions about how to use that time
- **Debating is perspective limited:** making one argument precludes others
- **Debating is rationality limited:** considering one case stops us considering others in the same detail
- Therefore, any decision we make comes with **opportunity costs**

What, therefore, do we do in a Whip Speech?

- We decide how to make the best use of each marginal unit of our time and energy to win the debate
- In earlier speeches, we need to gamble somewhat; by the Whip we should know the best decision
- Therefore, there is no correct or universal way to give a Whip Speech
- Do not fall into the trap of doing the same thing in every debate
- At every stage, ask yourself **“What is the most useful way to use my time?”**
- Crucially, give the judges what they want!

Goals of a Whip Speech

Things we want to do in a Whip Speech

- **Rebuild** the extension
- **Rebuttal** (especially against the other extension)
- Provide **framing**, **characterisations***, and **examples**
- **Compare** arguments and alternative worlds
- **Weighing** (most important actor, impact, metrics, trade-offs)
- **Clarification** of arguments and explanations in your partner's speech

Things we can't do in a Whip Speech

But which we may try to do anyway....

- **Mechanistic** analysis (Explaining why something occurs)
- **Stakeholder** analysis/incentives (Explaining why actors will/should act in certain ways)
- Justifying **principles** (Explaining why a principle is important or violated*)
- New **substantive** explanations (Any new positive analytical material)

Skills: Rebuilding the Extension

General Rules

- **Don't just give the same analysis**: respond to the rebuttal, flag insufficient responses, and develop areas of limited analysis
- **Don't under-sell the extension** when rebuilding it:
 - Never say you're "rebuilding"; you're explaining why the responses were insufficient
 - Explain why the other side misunderstood, don't say "what your partner meant to say"

How to rebuild

- **Flag up** the specific part of the extension which you're addressing, using the words your partner used if possible (this will show the judges that the material isn't new in the Whip, and helps with clarity)
- **Address the response** from the other side, taking the most charitable reading of their argument possible (this is especially important because the judges may read into their response, and they may even have another shot at rebuttal, so you need to ensure your rebuild deals with the best possible version of the response)
- **Rebut their rebuttal**, or frame it out of the debate (E.G. by showing that their responses could only be true in specific circumstances, which aren't true in this case)
- **Run through the chain of logic** again briefly afterwards, demonstrating that the whole argument now stands again and that the other side have failed to adequately deal with the argument

Skills: Rebuttal from Whip

- **Levels of rebuttal:** You've reached the end of the debate, so should be able to provide the fullest level of response: 1. The premise is wrong; 2. It won't happen; 3. It isn't a bad thing; 4. It isn't as important
 - Develop "even if" scenarios to ensure that the argument is definitely beaten, out-framed, or outweighed
 - You don't need to provide the full analysis if the rebuttal has already been made: refer back to where the point was defeated, or flag that one piece of rebuttal deals with multiple things.
- **Don't just argue the point to a wash:** explain why things get actively worse for the other side's goals
 - Crucially, relate things back to what you want to achieve in the debate: the reason that you and your partner decided you were going to win with your extension. Either the point fails to engage with your higher stakes, or your extension directly engages with the argument.
- **Break down the mechanisms/principles/logic of the other side:** if you show how the other side's benefits or harms cannot come to pass, you can either remove those impacts from the debate or take them for your side.
- **Don't just rebut the other side:** make sure that you fit the rebuttal into the wider debate. How does mitigating the other side, defeating their material, etc. weigh against the arguments you brought?

Skills: Frames & Characterisations

Value-neutral statements which clarify the debate: What will happen? Who is involved and how will they act? Where is the trade-off in this debate likely to occur? What do people think now and how will that change?

Start with what you know, then work out from there:

- **First:** do you know the true characterisation? It's not enough to just know, you need to be able to explain the example to judges who may be sceptical, even if your knowledge is correct.
- **Second:** are there similar cases you do know about which may be applicable? What are the key differences between your example and the case at hand? Work out how your example can be applied to this situation.
- **Third:** is there a general trade-off you can apply to the debate? If you don't know the specifics, you can simplify the characterisation into a basic trade-off, or avoid characterisation altogether by trying to abstract the debate, but you need to be able to explain why the abstraction applies to this case, and link it back to the motion.
- **Fourth:** use common sense to determine what will occur: how are the actors involved likely to act, and what is likely to happen on either side of the debate. Work out a logical characterisation, but be ready to be flexible if another team is able to challenge the characterisation.

Skills: Finding the Comparative

What is comparative analysis?

- **Compare the two sides of the motion:** don't just analyse one side in a vacuum
- **Determine the relative benefits and flaws** of each side and discuss them relative to one another
- **Comparative language:** use "er" words, "more/less", etc.
- How judges do OAs can be a good example: first assess what it looks like, then compare – you need both the individual characterisation of the world and the comparison between worlds.
- **E.G. THBT universities should establish "dangerous spaces":**
 - Don't just ask whether it is good when universities do this, also compare it to what happens when universities don't do it, and also ask what they would be doing instead and compare it to that as well – compare the whole world in each scenario
 - Note: link it to the change in the motion on the level of specificity/generality implied: you need to be making comparisons on the specific thing that is changing, and not something more or less general.
- **Development opportunity:** train your comparative analysis skills with the game in the next slide.

The Simple Choices Game

Use this training exercise to get better at finding the comparative for your Whip speech

1. Find two objects or choices to compare
2. Work out their relative assets / flaws
3. Work out any relevant context to the choice
4. Weigh between relative assets and flaws
5. Decide which option to choose

The attached handout gives some general rules to the game, runs through the example opposite in more detail, and has some further prompts to facilitate training opportunities.



Skills: Weighing Arguments

Why is your argument the most important?

- Your argument applies to all cases or more cases (or has less assumptions)
- Your argument applies to the most important group / actor
- Your argument applies to the group most directly / specifically / heavily affected
- Your argument has the highest impact
- Your argument always happens or is the most certain
- Your argument achieves benefits more universally than other arguments
- Your argument provides a necessary mechanism to allow the most important / urgent harm to be dealt with
- Your argument focuses on the short/long term, which is particularly important

You need to explain why the weight you assign is valid:

- What is your framework for assessing the practical or moral weight of arguments?
- Why is it important to emphasise one kind of impact over another?
- Compare arguments, don't just assess them in a vacuum
- Weigh arguments, but also weigh teams' contributions as a whole

Skills: Clarification

When you might need to clarify part of your team's case:

- When your case is overly complicated, and it's clear/possible that the judges do not understand
- When the other side has mischaracterised your case or where they did not respond to the extension and you feel it's necessary to restate it to demonstrate their lack of response
- When you want to strategically shift the case you ran in extension without compromising the integrity of the argument
- It is also just generally useful to clarify exactly what your team brought, separate from any other clashes

How to clarify without conceding ground:

- The same principles apply as when you are rebuilding the extension:
 - **Flag up** the part of the extension which wasn't clear
 - **Address** how the other side characterised the argument (their misunderstanding/weak responses)
 - **Clarify** how the argument should actually be viewed in the debate (through characterisation)
 - **Restate** the chain of logic around this part of the extension, showing how it actually works
- Don't concede that the argument was too complicated or that you are shifting the burden of the case: you are clarifying to deal with the other side's misunderstanding, and potentially to give them a chance to respond; or, you are dealing with their incorrect characterisation.

Rebuttal-Weighing Game

Use this exercise to practice rebuttal and weighing skills in the context of Whip Speeches

1. For a given motion, take a list of five general arguments which could be made by one side
2. Select three of the five arguments and explain why the argument is wrong (in its best possible form)
 - In this stage, you're practicing the rebuttal skill as if you were a whip speaker for the other side of the debate from the one making the arguments – as you would be when rebutting OO and CO as CG
3. From the remaining two arguments, select one and explain why it is more important than the other
 - In this stage, you're practicing the weighing skill as if you were a whip speaker for the side making these arguments – as you would be when comparing your team to OG as CG
4. Compare your answer to others in group training exercises – which arguments did they choose to weigh between and how did they justify the rebuttal / weighing?
 - In this stage, you're validating your own work and comparing it to what others do. Ideally, this is the best way to improve because you can see which approach is most convincing and prepare yourself for the situations in debates where teams are using competing weighing metrics.

The attached handout gives three example games you can practice with – generate more by watching debates and compiling arguments made by strong teams.

Structuring your Whip Speech

What will the structure of your Whip Speech depend on?

- **What do you need to contribute** to the debate in order to win? I.E. do you need to prioritise rebuttal, rebuilding, framing, weighing, etc. and what material within those categories?
- **Which teams do you want to prioritise** comparing yourself against? Don't just focus on beating teams who have already lost, ask which team poses the biggest threat to you, and who you are closest to beating/losing against – be strategic.
- **What did the debate look like?** Was it a messy debate with lots of arguments which don't fit in, or was it a very technical debate around how one particular mechanism or principle plays out?
- The goal should always be to **select the structure which will make it clearest that your team won** the debate.

Structuring a Whip Speech under time limitations

- The hardest part of structure will always be **dealing with limited time** while also working out all the rebuttal and arguments you need to fit in, especially if you need to take lots of notes.
- **Have a default option** in your mind for how you'll structure your whip ahead of time so that you never go up to speak without a plan, and **think during prep time** about how you might want to structure the debate, but **remain flexible and take time** during the speech before yours to make a decision about structure.

Typologies of Whip Speech

Ways you can structure a Whip Speech:

- **Chain of logic**
- **Varieties of case**
(stakeholders, countries, contexts, frameworks, sections of a community e.g. LGBTQ+)
- **Extension + Rebuttal / Pure Rebuttal ***
- **False Adjudication / Team-based ***
(i.e. You vs. OG, vs. OO, vs. Closing)
- **Points of Clash ***
- **Principle + Practical**

When to use it:

- **When you have one key logical claim**
- **When you're dealing with lots of different situations or actors and want to win on all of them or wash the ones you can't win**
- **When the other side has lots of substantive material left standing and your extension is strong**
- **When teams have relatively different contributions or you beat each team for different reasons**
- **When the debate can be structured by a small number of themes**
- **When there are distinct but important debates on the principles and practicalities**

How to Prepare

Before the debate:

- Work out **what the debate will come down to**: will it be proving a particular point of efficacy / morality / impact? Will it be won by effectively characterising/framing the debate?
- Decide what your **most likely extension** will be and work through arguments backwards from there so that you and your partner both know what the extension is likely to be with minimal communication
- Prepare notes for **important pieces of analysis or framing** you may need to use in the whip

During the debate:

- **Pay attention** to how arguments are being received in the debate, both **objectively** (take a step back and think like a judge: how is this argument engaging with the broader debate and what are its strengths/flaws) and **subjectively** (are the judges responding well to the speaker, and how does the argument fit into the framing of the debate your team is trying to create)
- **Keep track** of which arguments have been responded to on both sides (at a granular level of analysis) and **how teams are performing** relative to one another (to know which team is your biggest threat)
- **Communicate** with your partner, but **don't give them information they don't need**: they shouldn't be giving rebuttal unless they need to get it out of the way before extending; **confirm the extension!**

Strategy: Burdens

Setting strategic burdens

- At the end of the debate, you are uniquely positioned to **establish the burdens** for both sides, so that when judges go back through their notes, they evaluate each team's material in terms of the burdens you set
- **Set burdens that seem fair and intuitive**, drawing on the wording of the motion or common/simple to grasp intuitions, so that your burdens seem inherent to the debate, rather than unfairly constructed to advantage your team (whether they are or not)
- **Set burdens which your team won**, and which show why you were particularly strong / relevant – ideally seek to find a theoretical space where the debate is hard to contest and intuitively favours your side
- **E.G. THBT criminal justice policy should be decided by appointed technocrats rather than elected representatives, speaking as Opposition Whip**
 - *"It is about who has the final decision, not about whether both exist. The comparative is very small because there are politicians and there are also advisors on both sides. The point is who gets the final decision. Do we say the technocrats listen to all the political views and make a decision about which is right, which is impossible because there is no right decision, or do we say the technocrats give all of the evidence and politicians prioritise which matters more for people. On a very simple level the weigh up is that it's very hard to get any of the benefits they want, but we can preserve people's preferences."*
 - See the full debate at: <https://fb.watch/2P5hAuHLGe/>

Strategy: POIs & Playing for Second

Points of Information

- Yours:
 - Agree POI focus and wording with your partner so that you're in agreement
 - While your partner is writing their extension, you should offer POIs, and vice versa
 - Select what you offer in your POI carefully: do not give away too much of your case, but be willing to flag up the way your team is going to contribute to the debate so that everybody can engage with it
- Theirs: often POIs summarise / indicate another team's case or why they think they should win, so you should listen to them and think about how to respond to the simple statement of the POI during your case, especially when an opening team have used a POI to state a simple and clear version of their case.

Playing for second

- Sometimes you may not be able to win, but you may want to fight for second place (especially in outrounds)
- **Winning as a bench**: show why your side of the debate wins decisively, even if your opening won more
- **Winning as a bottom half**: show why the most important part of the debate was ignored in top half
- **Winning as a diagonal**: show why only you dealt with the important case on the other side
- Note that **using a combination of these three metrics** also indicates why your team is winning and can form the basis of whip speeches

Strategy: Note-taking

Everyone has different needs when it comes to notes; do what works for you. On the next slide I'll share an example of what works for me.

Checklist: what you may want to be noting down

- The **arguments** raised by other teams and the logical links they rely on, any sub-points within them, responses from the other side, or burdens / justifications / weighing metrics
- Exactly what your partner said in **extension** (not just what you discussed in prep time!)
- How you intend to lay out the Whip e.g. **structure**, opening, closing
- **What you are going to say** e.g. rebuttal, characterisations, framing, etc.
- What the key **'points of clash'** are, or the flow of the debate

Thematic note-taking:

- Rather than noting each team's contributions separately as they occur, you can sort notes by theme (which is especially useful if you plan to Whip by theme/points of clash)
- List new areas of the debate as they arise, then note what each team is saying under each, allowing you to refer back to where the clash is on each area, and where your partner's extension fits into each issue

Note-taking examples

Extension ideas

1. Encourage better attitude to conservation and use of resources
2. Suffering of poor people and natural life, effects on biodiversity which are needed for life
3. Good way of building a new economy
4. Preservation
5. Good meaningful life can exist away from Earth
6. Good clean environment work
7. Policy of hope

PM:

1. Global efforts of humanity, all working together
2. Scarc resources/demand
3. Adv advance efficiency
4. Scarc wealth/jobs
5. Scarc sustainable
6. Scarc needs of humanity
7. Scarc planet will die [it] poorest hurt most

CG:

1. Scarc potentially infinite resources
2. Scarc Scarc breaks down
3. Scarc humanity can go on forever

CG:

1. Scarc poor people better off after rich people leave
2. Scarc Scarc competition for resources
3. Scarc sustainability for ideal conditions for life
4. Scarc barriers to solving climate change

1) Finite Resources (also deals with 6/7)

- a. Frame: clarity of which resources?
- b. Fuel resources – contingent on animal life
- c. Fuel resources – contingent on animal life/soil/microbes
 - i. Ability to replicate helps CC also – wash
- d. Also claimed efficiency – less efficient space travel
- e. Same net resources – about usage **
 - i. Importance of teaching moderate use
 - ii. Resource intensity/wastage of space travel
- f. Best case: economics doesn't fix this (point 7) – resources still finite by access e.g. 5th Road historically **

2) Wealth and Jobs

- a. Contingent on above to an extent
- b. Symmetrical – jobs in ecology
- c. Link about the commute being shorter

3) Terraforming

- a. Not inevitable – challenges to the technology
- b. Conditions required
 - i. Difference between our universe and the moon
 - ii. Best case: still not a meaningful life – see extension **
 - iii. Diversity of ecosystem also limited in best case **
 - iv. Also a wash if tech exists it can solve CC more easily: refer also to OG (page) about global cooperation

4) Meeting Needs

- a. General point: OG case fails to create meaningful life, only about meeting needs which is not enough

5) Morality (two claims: inherently immoral as planet dying; immoral due to wealthy accessing most resources)

- a. Unclear why first is immoral but if it is, more so to leave some people behind
- b. Policies of adaptation/preservation solve this problem to some extent, OG cover this clash but here are explicit examples: **
 - i. Less growth economics
 - ii. Therefore less waste/exploitative practices
 - iii. Therefore less MNC concentration of wealth

6) Humanity lives forever

- a. Misses logical links
- b. Just pushes down the line to stop one crisis (and non-comp)
- c. Best case: comes at expense of all other life – refer to the biodiversity case in the extension **

9) Poor people better off

- a. Unfair claim: comparative assumes no preservation
- b. Concession: argument assumes a synergy between the interests of the poor and preservation (refer to 5b above)
- c. Discovering solutions to CC elsewhere
 - i. Refer to char in extension/OG (doesn't work)
 - ii. No reason for the rich to return – see OG **
 - iii. Explicitly not the debate so again unfair comparative

10) Resource competition

- a. Argument relies on good practice developing in resource usage, or those left behind expand consumption – refer to extension
- b. Resource intensity of space travel

11) Ideal conditions

- a. Framing: what would world look like if this was true – not mutual

12) Barriers to solving CC

- a. Motion: humanity preserves adapts: unfair burden
- b. Comparatively easier to resolve than barriers in physics on Gov

Speech Structure

Framing:

1. Respond to attacks on POC and provide characterisation for why life cannot exist

Refutal 11

Refutal 3

Ext: animal suffering and biodiversity

Points:

1. Use of resources

Ext: attitude to conservation

Refutal 1-2

Refutal 10

Refutal 12

Ext: additional attacks for missing CC case OG

2. Greed of humanity

Ext: What is a meaningful life?

Refutal 4

Refutal 8

Weigh other arguments

Refutal 9

Compare to OG on poor people/those who stay behind

Refutal 5

Compare to OG on moral burden-planetarity on humanity

Make fun of OG's city limited Nations argument

** = added during a later speech

From things like:

1. There is no right answer to most moral justice problems, and we should let politicians choose which countries we should prioritise because it's a choice and any other system is just randomly picking one over the other
2. You can't just solve moral justice issues with policies in moral justice, it's part of a much bigger system of laws with complex issues
3. These 2 things undermine the whole debate, because it means the best case improves for OG so that they get closer to their policies. If these do not exist, they lose their benefits and if they cannot solve the problems, or the chance they solve them is low, then we should prioritise what we can defend, which is the preference people have
4. Note the other basis rely on a particular world view being correct which requires a massive logical leap more than our case does as should be less persuasive

A. Responses to CG

- a. They say there is no moral burden, but where there's consensus in academia there's usually consensus in politics
 - i. They relied here on the asserted example about disease when in fact politicians don't think climate exists – note 2 things
 - ii. Very odd few say that any more
 - iii. Those who do based on cases of these academics and the handful of studies that disagree
 - ii. But we can actually hold them to account when it comes from the politicians rather than the academics you can't reject if you don't have the science
 - iii. That was the response to CG which was 4. But's speech but would they think we can't as relevant to the ship
 - iv. Then they give examples of political thinking – but look that evidence actually does disagree here – the science of human morality and behaviour is what used to justify extreme gun policies
- a. They also concede that technocrats have no incentive on their side to appeal to politicians – note that's exactly what Kar told you is the reason why technocrats develop to support different political operators – people have different political backgrounds and appear to them through research – that's at least common but we at least have some accountability on the final decision
 - i. But it's not just accountability, it's also people's right – politics is changing in a positive example of the decay of trust, if you think that life today technocrats are ignoring the reality of some, they will take on the role of protecting the public in their own hands and that gets much worse
 - ii. See the politicians might promote advisors who align with their policies – that's literally the POINT of ROBE'S EXISTENCE, the public choose what experts matter to them, and find advisors to promote what it is they want started to do – whether reducing inequality, or reducing crime
- a. The next response is that they deserve more flexibility on what political justice, controlling funding, and control over the politics and a huge number of other things that are GO DEPRIVATION not "moral justice"
 - i. There is a world outside the USA, not everyone elects a range of conservative governments, and even then the previous US president engaged in a massive program of dismantling criminal justice

B. Peter Follmer

1. There seems that policies in criminal justice – note their sudden use of effects show that they can get more stuff
2. Even the best policy won't work in every case
 - a. This case with the highest number of GO's heavy characterisation the policies in every case
3. They're only changing one aspect of the complex systems of government – its resources and secondary structures will work to accommodate this
 - a. This is especially true of scientific policy, rely on the fact that with a 10% to solve certain people's health, they just change their political justice
 - b. Get also on these examples, the white technocrats are likely to be the 2. Heals to be friendly and equal to revised – they tend to be the other of cooperation
 - c. That's why if you look at the pricing policy in the real world which is changed to be driven by data, it's better pricing because the data say rather than the technocrats pricing they say where there is only data
 - i. Substituted for 2 reasons:
 1. ONE: To the extent that CG want innovation it stops happened anywhere else before, there's evidence it hasn't been done before
 2. TWO: There is lots of data from across history, so it's just make a choice and claim it was perfect for data, there's no choice in any real person or based, they're data which cannot be contradicted
 - d. In all this sense, technocrats are less accountable and very high change being passed along – but you can't call them out for being bad because political choice, it's more as "the right thing"
4. All this change to criminal justice, not politics, not economic redistribution, not employment, not education

C. Principle of Justice

1. WANT DATA GO TO US WEIGHT
 - a. Societies no moral codes as states – individuals
 - b. Crimes against individual people
 - c. Technocrats have had no moral ideas because they don't contact people
 - d. Good to represent people's preferences
2. Should be clear that this is not a complete principle for two reasons – I'll just tell you about this because it was at least in the middle of his practice. Place the principle so that we can win on this idea
 - a. First, it relies on which case has more accountability by the public, and in the debate on which to move accountable – technocrats or politicians especially important because there is no evidence on the comparative why it doesn't create the problems they do
 - i. CG accept people want outcomes but note that they also want processes – it's why most people want more open democratic support including all the homeless people and ending that – so it's fair to let people have a preference about HOW some and not just say the outcome will make it all
 - ii. For says ultimately there are public founded on principle justice policy and having a spectrum of advisors means public that off – and the fact that we preserve the final decision with

D. Better policies

- context
- specific e.g. of racism
- **** racial profiling e.g. here
- politicians represent old people
- political incentives short-term
- **** compare
- **** legacy
- **** want to change / represent
- **** voters not dumb
- innovation
- **** char: no data

2. Decision making

- accountability better, can be fired
- **** feedback mechanism
- **** CG rely on this – discourse
- **** weigh importance – role of criminal justice in lives
- **** comparative from prep
- background
- evidence

00

1. Justice

- societies no moral codes as states – individuals
- crimes against individual people
- technocrats have had no moral ideas because they don't contact people
- good to represent people's preferences
- **** relies on accountability
- **** weigh against crime etc.?

2. Still have advisors

- get best of both
- politicians use advisors
- **** final choice
- **** narrow weighing – principle

3. Decision-making

- politicians represent people
- links to principle – opinions matter
- **** doesn't clash with OG
- **** what is a good decision – can it exist?

CG

**** = added during a later speech

Left: transcription of hand-written notes; Above: online notes with notepad for quick bullet-points and document for full speech

Summary

Key points:

- Use the Whip Speech to prioritise what you need to do to win the debate
- Rebuild the case, rebut the other side, weigh arguments, and frame why you win the debate
- Structure your whip to take advantage of how the debate has played out, and remain flexible
- Prepare for the whip before and during the debate and communicate with your partner
- Think strategically to ensure your whip shows why you defeated all the other teams