

Whip Speeches

What to do and not to do...!

Some 'Do Nots'

- A terrible trend in debating: 'non-rebuttal'
- Repetition
- Leaving it up to judges

Revising the objective

- Winning in BP Debating is unique, but also unpredictable
- General Theory:
 - Win on three direct comparisons to win the debate
 - Within constraints: time, novelty, plausibility, regional priorities, the way material plays out
 - Constrained Optimisation Exercise
- Whip is unique:
 - Debate has played out, extension has been delivered
 - Little to no anticipation, makes it a position you can consistently well in

A Note on Extension Construction and Closing Strategy

- The optimal whip speeches follow extension speeches that:
 - Look, sound, and are distinct
 - Run grounded, plausible central impacts (esp. alongside risky material)
 - Are mechanistically robust**
 - Have explicit strategic intent in their design
 - Quality over quantity
- Tools available to you at Whip:
 - Flesh out impacting beyond central selection
 - Rebut and Weighing
 - Strategic Commentary and Positioning**
- The control you have at closing makes it most conducive to overcoming rep-judging and social corruption
 - The margins and adjudication are heavily influenced by the Whip speech

A Framework for Whip Speeches

- Team-by-Team or Issues?
 - Somewhere in between, both work
 - Example structure later
- Three central components:
 - Strategic Positioning of the Extension
 - Why does the extension comparatively win the debate, in and of itself (i.e. without
 - Rebuilding, Internal Strategic Commentary and Rebuttal
 - In that order
 - Weighing Rebuilt Extension against Refuted Claims from the other side

Positioning your extension

- Legitimacy and Direct Comparison with opening
 - Novelty, robustness
- Impact
- Why should the judge buy your extension outright?

How to weigh analysis extensions

- Important as motions become shallower and less thought out (especially in CG)
- For many judges, analysis extensions come with uniqueness red-flags
- If you decide to run an analysis extension:
 - Listen to the exact impacts and mechanisms that come out, track them honestly
 - Make sure that both you and your partner are aware the precise difference in the mechanisms/context/

Rebuttal, Rebuilding and Strategic Commentary

- Rebuilding:
 - Pinpoint where the extension is unintuitive and explain
 - Critically listening to your Member to determine where there are gaps in explanation
 - Listen to the exact responses that come from the other side
- Rebuttal:
 - Comparative
 - Characterisation
 - Tipping Point
 - Mechanistic Completeness?
 - Mitigation
- Strategic Commentary:
 - Making sure you are telling the judge exactly how you intend to win a specific comparison, or what you are about to refute/rebuild and why

Weighing

- Internal
 - Characterisation comparisons (debates on social movements, political strategy etc.)
- External
 - Discrete, distinct outcomes weighed against each other
 - Intensity, scale, uniqueness etc.
- A contingency:
 - Even if the judge doesn't buy your initial strategic positioning, comparing your contribution to the mitigated/defeated claims of the other side makes it easier

A Note on Gov Whip

- Opp Whip follows, and one speech to deal with the CO Case
 - Lots of manoeuvring capacity
- Two ways to mitigate backload capacity:
 - Focus on thorough deconstructing the mechanisms of the argument (no new mechs allowed in OW)
 - Outweigh the most generous incarnation of the claim from CO
 - Explicitly point out what is not permissible from the OW
- Overcoming the double burden of responding and rebuilding?
 - Prioritise rebuilding, and 'structural responses' on mechs, and weighing

How to Prioritise Material (Deploying Framework)

- Which claims, already floating in the debate, harm your extension from standing
 - Explicit material from the opening half
 - Implicit responses from the opening half
- Risk Aversion
 - In-Round Strategy: Avoid a 4th before anything else
 - Making sure the extension stands
 - Then directly dealing with each team
- Reading the judge, and the round reaction to your extension, and prioritising accordingly
 - Grain of Salt

Tracking the debate

- Two stages (Can Integrate):
 - Critically and generously tracking claims from the debate
 - Writing up the Whip Speech
- Stage 1:
 - Colours help
 - Claim, Mech, Comment
- Stage 2:
 - Prioritising and writing

New Material?

- A grey line, err on the side of caution
- Space for discourse on how material ought to be evaluated