

Rebuttal

Strategy

- Time is limited, some arguments must be abandoned or only touched on.
- Start by giving an overall thesis to the speech
- If you can meet their value, then it is ok to drop yours

If you want to retain your value, you have several options

1. Subsume (*to include or place within something larger or more comprehensive: encompass as a subordinate or component element* <red, green, and yellow are subsumed under the term "color">) their value under yours
2. Mitigate (*to cause to become less harsh or hostile - usage Mitigate is sometimes used as an intransitive (followed by against) where militate might be expected. Even though Faulkner used it <some intangible and invisible social force that mitigates against him — William Faulkner> and one critic thinks it should be called an American idiom, it is usually considered a mistake.*) their value, strengthen yours

The same can be done with the criterion. You have the option to subsume, mitigate or adopt. BUT, make sure you draw a fresh picture in the judge's mind about the connection

Strategize

Now that you have your thesis, we can prioritize arguments in this order

1. Arguments that are critical to winning
2. Arguments you can easily prove wrong with warrants or data
 - Your opponent may have a weak point against your argument
3. Arguments which you have direct evidence/reasons against
 - Either your opponent misunderstood your argument or failed to see a point you make elsewhere in the debate
4. Arguments for which you have indirect evidence/reasons against
 - Ex: "My opponent says that we shouldn't give people charity because if they are poor, it's because they are lazy. But, with food stamps, many homeless seek jobs. So, poor people aren't lazy, they are victims of unfortunate circumstance."

Lets practice

- Using our most recent debate – check your flowing notes for the first affirmative rebuttal. Re-prioritize their arguments in the previous slides suggested order.

Organization

- **SAPCOPS**
 - STATE the argument to be refuted
 - Provide a brief summary of the ANALYSIS (reasons, data)
 - PPOINT out what your opponent did not say
 - CCOUNTER the argument (this is a claim)
 - PROVE your argument (warrant and data)
 - SUMMARIZE and move on (Impact)

Example

S (state)- "My opponent states if people are poor, it's because they are lazy..."

A (analysis)- ...citing evidence that there are plenty of available jobs...

P (point)- ...but he does not illustrate the conditions under which people cannot seek work...

CO (counter)- ...During hard times, people are unable to find work...

P (prove)- ... its unreasonable to believe that under the distress of a death in the family or the hunger from starvation that people can think about work and prepare for an interview. We know that when the government provides food coupons, individuals are able to get jobs

S (summarize)- Therefore, giving to charity uplifts people out of unfortunately times, reduce poverty through finding them gainful employment, thereby upholding the cherished value of life."

Let's Try it!

- Listen to and Flow the following Affirmative Contention
- Use SARCOPS to create your negative rebuttal
- Share out loud & Turn in Notes