Introductions (Level 3)

What will we cover

#1

Harms based introductions

A common basic introduction to use

#2

Responsive introductions

A more advanced introduction to use for later speakers

#3

Sample introductions from university debaters

Samples of our introductions in practice

Harms-based introductions

Drawing on your adjudicators human tendencies to create a compelling introduction

Harms-Based Introductions

How do we use them?

- A harm-based introduction focuses on a harm, taking advantage of the adjudicator's (normal human) tendency to want to avoid bad things.
- **For affirmative**: this means identifying the biggest harm with the status quo ("the problem").
- **For negative**: this means identifying the biggest harm that will result from the affirmative's model.
- It is not enough to simple state that there is a harm. You need to sell us on why it's bad, and how it loses the other team the debate. This can be achieved by doing a few things:
    - Show rather than tell (at least initially). Use imagery. Paint pictures with your words.
    - Be rhetorical.
    - Humanise the harm. Make it clear who is harmed and how.
    - Real-life examples are great, but make sure to generalise to the broader topic.
- Don't forget to make sure to generalise—explain how this harm loses the other team the debate or is indicative of a structural issue that your model can fix.

Responsive Introductions

Integrating your tactical debating skills into your introduction

Responsive Introductions

How do we use them?

- The second type of introduction should be newer to you. We call them 'responsive' introductions.
- Responsive introductions do what they say on the tin: they responds to a claim that the other team has made!
  - You can identify something silly they said, or a big flaw in their reasoning. Importantly: demonstrate that the specific flaw you identify generalises (it is symptomatic of a broader problem with their case) or in some way loses them the debate.
  - One way to do this might be to take your best rebuttal and working it into an introduction. Note that this is not the same thing as merging your rebuttal section with your introduction, they are still separate (you are not just starting with the rebuttal section).
- Shortcuts:
  - Common bases for a responsive introduction include: A. Their claims are heavily contingent on another claim, which you can disprove, b) There is a contradiction in their case (a bit weaker), c) They got a factual detail incorrect in a way that is important and makes a difference to how the adjudicator should see the debate.

Sample introductions

Learn from experts

WUDC 2016

Topic: THB that the world's poor would be justified in pursuing complete Marxist revolution.
Harms based introduction

WUDC 2010

Topic: This House believes that the media should show the full horror of war.

Harms based introduction

WUDC 2011

Topic: THW invade Zimbabwe

Responsive introduction