

Before you ask...

This is our vain attempt to answer those silly and not so silly questions which always pop up before Round 1 gets announced. Read this carefully: you'll find many of the questions which might pop up in your brain, are already answered. Questions are grouped according to team, except for the general questions, which are, well, general.

Regarding General Issues

How should I offer a point of information?

Stand up and say something non-descript like "On that point..", or "Point of information". DO NOT announce your point before you've been accepted. For example: "On the effectiveness of bringing democracy in Iraq". This is NOT NICE and will be punished. Once your point is accepted, you ask a question which lasts no longer than 15 seconds.

Are points of order and points of personal privilege allowed?

No.

What are points of order and points of personal privilege?

You don't care. You're not going to use them.

Can I make a point of information on my partner, or on the other team on my side of the House?

No.

Can I speak longer than the allotted 7 minutes?

No.

Can I speak shorter than the allotted 7 minutes?

Technically you can – but it shows you haven't got anything left to say.

Regarding First Proposition

Can we squirrel?

NO!

What's a squirrel?

It's when first proposition defines the motion as something completely other than the organisation intended it to be. So: "THBT NATO should be disbanded" should be about the North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation, not about that undoubtedly existing 80's electro-punk band with overaged unshaved leftwing-feminists still screaming their "I Wanna Be Kim Wilde"-lyrics, which also happens to be named 'NATO'.

Can we place-set?

At the Amsterdam Open, the default place-set is the European Union – unless the motion specifies otherwise (a rather concocted example would be: "THW divide Germany into East and West again" – this would be very awkward if place-set in France.). One could also reasonably place-set into 'democratic, developed countries'. Place-setting is unfair if it gives first proposition an argumentative advantage which is not needed for the case. This advantage can stem from the fact that they either place-set it in their home country or place-set it someplace far away which just happened to be in their case-file.

Can we time-set?

No.

Do we have to have a model?

The short answer: Yes.

The long answer: There's two things you can do as proposition: *or* you deliver a model, *or* you establish a principle of policy. For example, the motion "THBT we should invade Iraq" was a motion which would have required a model. Look in the quickguide to see what a model is. The Motion "THBT affirmative action is wrong" basically *implies* that the state should abandon and prohibit all measures of affirmative action, but specifying it further beyond this implication isn't necessary: if we give you a motion like this, we expect you run a *principle*-debate, where you try and establish the merits and arguments for and against using "affirmative action" as a guideline for how government should do things.

Regarding First Opposition

What do we do when First Proposition squirrels?

Cheer, because they've done a stupid thing. Then: add insult to injury by debating what they've squirreled onto better than they could themselves. So: if they squirrel, just say it once in your speech if you don't trust your judge to pick up on it, and then debate the way that first prop has set it up, as good as it gets.

What's the difference between counterpropping and challenging the definition?

Counterpropping is arguing that you have a better solution than the proposition for the problem that proposition defined. *Challenging the definition* is saying: "the proposition interpreted the motion not as it should have been interpreted. Here is what *they* should have said. This is what we would have said if they would have said what they should have said". As a general rule: DO NOT EVER challenge the definition, and ALMOST NEVER counterprop.

When should I counterprop?

Did I say ALMOST NEVER? Better make that: NOT EVER. Unless you really, really need to. But it involves conceding that you agree with everything prop is trying to do. And that's quite the concession, really...

Regarding Second Proposition

Should we bring an extension?

Yes.

What's an extension?

An extension is some new constructive argument in the debate, OR it could be a deeper (read: far better) analysis of an argument that the first proposition gave. You *need* to bring an extension, because the judges will want to see 'what you added to the table'. Your

extension basically justifies you sitting there after two teams have already spoken. So, bring it.

Should I signpost my extension?

Only if you see your judge sleeping or otherwise scooting off. Most judges however will judge you on the *content* and *quality* of what you said – so, if you signpost it as extension, but it was in fact just rehashing an argument which first proposition already brought, and that in a bad way too, it just doesn't count as an extension.

Can I change the model that first proposition gave?

No. It implies you see there are weaknesses in the model they gave – and that implies that you're actually more on Opposition's-side on this particular weakness.

Even if first proposition was really stupid?

Even then. Bad luck is a fact of life. Deal with it.

What should I do in the summary?

Summarize the debate. You can react, shortly (meaning: around one minute max.), to whatever mutilation Second Opposition has wreaked upon your partner's extension. Do NOT bring any new arguments. New examples to already given arguments are allowed, but new arguments are NOT DONE.

Regarding Second Opposition

If First Opposition accepts the definition, can I then still challenge it?

No.

Can we counterprop?

No.

Should we stick to the counterprop that first opposition made?

What you should NOT do is either bring a new counterprop or modify their counterprop. You *can* decide to leave first op's counterprop undefended, if you have enough new arguments and analysis ready.

Do we have to bring an extension, too?

Yes.

But isn't my job to kill the extension given by second proposition?

That too.

Oh dear! – so many things to do, what comes first?

These tasks are not mutually exclusive. Just like second proposition has to make clear why the heck they are there, taking up time after two teams already have spoken, you have to do the same. Make yourself relevant by killing Second Proposition, killing the entire Proposition, *and* by adding new matter or analysis. It's up to you to decide in what order, but this is what you need to do.

What should I do in the summary?

Summarize the debate. Do NOT bring any new arguments. New examples to already given arguments are allowed, but new arguments are NOT DONE.