



## **The CDL “Blow-Up Drill”**

A blow-up drill is a great debate practice to run when you have limited time, too few (or too many) debaters, or debaters of too varying experience levels for a full practice debate. The format is simple – the coach (or a more experienced debater) creates a 2AC block (simulating a block you might see a typical opponent read) against a common negative argument that many debaters on the team like to run. Each debater then prepares a 5 minute negative speech extending the negative position and answering the 2AC arguments, followed by comments from the coach on things the debater did well and things to improve on. The other debaters should practice flowing during each other’s speeches and listen to the coaches’ comments.

Sample 2AC for a blow-up drill on the 2011-12 Core Files Spending Disadvantage.

- 1) Non-unique – the economy is already collapsing (Christian Science Monitor Evidence – Core Files Page 263)
- 2) Non-unique – the government spends new money all the time. Examples include huge military spending and new health care reform (Analytical argument)
- 3) No-link – space policy is not expensive (Vedda Evidence – Core Files Page 263)
- 4) No specific link – the INC link card is about space spending generically, not the affirmative plan (Analytical argument)
- 5) Turn – the government needs to spend money to improve the economy (Christian Science Monitor Evidence – Core Files Page 264)
- 6) No impact – economic collapse won’t cause war because there are new checks within the market that will prevent it from escalating (Analytical argument)

The farther from the Core Files version of 2AC arguments you make your 2AC arguments, the more you will be requiring your debaters to think critically and originally about how they should answer these arguments, and the less able they will be to fall back on the Core Files versions of the negative block argumentation. The sample 2AC above is only moderately distinct from the Core Files 2AC – you very well may wish to carry your 2ACs further away from the Core Files.

Examples of things to listen for during a less experienced student's speech:

Do they sound clear / confident / etc.?

Do they seem to grasp the story behind the negative argument they are extending?

Are they answering each affirmative argument? Are they staying in the 2AC order?

Are they reading new evidence in the proper places as well as making their own arguments?

Do they understand the purpose of the uniqueness, link, and impact portions of the disadvantage?

Additional suggested things to watch for in more experienced debaters' speeches:

Did they include a micro-overview? Did it include comparative impact analysis?

Are they debating using their flow instead of a stack of evidence or pre-scripting their speech?

Are they properly / efficiently referencing the affirmative's arguments to help the judge's flow?

Are they utilizing their 1NC evidence in answering 2AC arguments?

Are they making specific analytic criticisms of the affirmative's evidence?

Written by Avery Dale, 2012.