

LESSON 3: FLOWING



Objective of Lesson 3:

Learn why flowing is so important and how to effectively flow and pre-flow constructive and rebuttal speeches.

We've observed already that "good flowing" is essential to winning a debate. Unfortunately, there is no magic set of instructions about flowing that can make someone good at it. We can explain what it is, but success at it requires lots of practice, so you will have to be willing to put in the effort if you want to become good at flowing. Rest assured it will pay off: It is not a coincidence that winning debaters are always good at flowing.

Flowing is the process of writing down a well-organized, legible summary of all the arguments made by all the debaters in the constructives and rebuttals, including your own. It is essential to effective

debating and you should not bother competing in debate nor taking a debate class if you are not willing to do it. Improved flowing is the single biggest thing most beginning debaters can do to improve their chances of winning debate rounds.

Why Flowing Is So Important

Why is flowing so important? Because, *if you don't flow it, you don't know it*. This is why we have a saying at our camps and in our classes:

You have to flow every time. That, my friends, is the bottom line.

You will not be able to remember all the arguments the 1AC made five minutes after he made them. You will then not be able to remember all the arguments the 1NC made, and the problem keeps snowballing as the debate progresses. When the 2A gets up and says, “Remember what my partner’s card said in 1A about economic harms?” you will have no idea what he is talking about if you didn’t flow it.

When I’m judging, I can tell when debaters aren’t flowing well. I will hear a statement like this: “Now in the last speech, he said something about the economy.” This tells me that the current speaker is trying to recall something off the top of his head, but he really doesn’t have an accurate summary of it written down and he probably doesn’t know what he’s talking about. “Something about the economy”—that could be anything.

If his flow had been complete, he would have said it more like this: “Now in the last speech, his third disadvantage was that it would cause a recession and loss of a million jobs.” See how much better that is? Notice how much more persuasive this guy sounds already? He’s on the right track because he’s flowing better.

In the last two lessons, you observed debate rounds and understand the eight columns of the flowsheet. Now let’s dig deeper into how to utilize that flowsheet in order to make you an excellent debater.

Flowing the Constructives

We provided you some templates for a flowsheet, but the idea could be just as easily mapped out on an 11x14-inch legal pad. Turn it sideways and divide it into eight columns, labeling each column with the eight speeches of the round (1AC, 1NC, 2AC, 2NC, 1NR, 1AR, 2NR, 2AR). Cross-examination does not have to be flowed because issues raised in CX are questions, not arguments, and they don’t become arguments until someone says them in a subsequent speech. You should have something that looks like this:

Lesson 3: Flowing

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR

Once we know where all the speeches will go, we then focus on writing brief summaries of each argument, plus any additional information that might be needed to help us respond intelligently to the points made in the round. The 1AC is the first speech in the round, so let’s consider an example of how it would be flowed. Below is a greatly simplified sample of a made-up 1AC, followed by a sample flow that a negative debater would make while listening to this speech. The 1AC below is not offered as a perfect model for a 1AC, and it is incomplete in some ways. It is offered only for the purpose of illustrating flowing.

“Good morning. My name is John Smith and I will be telling you today about an urgent problem facing the world today in which aid money intended for the poor in Africa ends up in the hands of corrupt elites and fuels civil wars and even terrorism. These problems compel my partner and me to affirm: That the United States should significantly change its foreign aid policies.

Observation 1: We offer the following definitions, all from Woobster’s 9th edition dictionary in 2015: Significant: having great meaning. Aid: assistance given to one in need. Foreign: pertaining to a country outside of one’s own.

Observation 2: Inherency: the US donates billions of dollars to African governments. Prof. Alf Landon, UCLA Policy Review, December 2015: “The US government donates around \$10 billion per year for assistance programs in Africa. Most of this money goes to the governments in the region.”

Observation 3: Harms.

Harm 1: Aid given to governments fuels civil wars. Hank Haggerty, BOSTON GLOBE, 7 July 2012: “Civil wars in Ubanga and Obongo have been prolonged and worsened by the influx of cash from US government aid programs to the governments in the region.”

Harm 2: Corrupt elites steal money intended for the poor. Wes Woozy, NEW YORK TIMES, 8 June 2011: “US aid officials estimate that around 50% of the poverty relief aid money donated to African governments last year was stolen by corrupt elites.”

Harm 3: African aid fuels terrorism. R.U. Sirius, NEWS QUARTERLY, Summer 2015: “Several terrorist groups, including Al-Qaeda, receive payoffs from corrupt government officials in Africa, and a lot of that money comes from cash siphoned away from US aid programs.”

*Observation 4: We offer the following plan:
1: Agency. Congress and the US State Department.*

Unit I: Structure of Policy Debate

- 2: Mandates. All foreign aid to Africa shall be donated to Non-Governmental Organizations from now on.
- 3: Funding. Current budget for foreign aid shall be continued from current sources.
- 4: Enforcement shall be through the US State Department.
- 5: This plan takes effect immediately upon an affirmative ballot.
- 6: The affirmative team reserves the right to clarify the plan in later speeches.

Observation 5: Advantages

Advantage 1: Reduced risk of civil wars. Frank Jones, NEW REVIEW, 2015: “If Western governments would stop giving aid money directly to African governments, civil wars would often dry up and evaporate due to lack of cash for weapons and troops.”

Advantage 2: The poor receive aid, not corrupt elites. Barney Rubble, STONEHENGE TIMES, 2016: “Directing US relief programs in Africa to relief organizations rather than the African governments would bypass the corrupt elites and significantly reduce the theft of aid that robs the world’s poorest people of the help they desperately need.”

Advantage 3: Stop funding terrorism. Wes Woozy, FOREIGN REVIEW, 2016: “If the US government redirected its aid to non-governmental organizations and away from corrupt regimes, many terrorist groups in Africa would find themselves seriously starved of revenues.”

What should appear on the four flowsheets (five, if you count the judge) in the room now? Remember that the affirmative team must flow its own arguments too, and a smart 1A will pre-flow the outline of his 1AC onto his flow before he even gets to the tournament. Everyone should have a flow that looks something like the one below:

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
I. DEF Signif, aid, foreign II. INH US=\$10B/yr to Afr govts III. HARMS 1. civil war 2. elites steal \$ 3. terrorism – payoffs from govt officials IV. PLAN All Afr aid thru NGO's V. ADV 1. ↓civil wars 2. poor get \$ 3. ↓\$ to terror							

Before continuing, let’s look at what is flowed, how it’s flowed, and what isn’t flowed. First, notice the widespread use of abbreviations: “DEF” for definitions; “INH” for inherency; “\$” for money or funding; “Afr” for Africa or African; and the “down arrow” indicating reduction or less of something. You and your partner will develop a consistent set of abbreviations that the two of you can both

Lesson 3: Flowing

understand, and you will use these over and over again to save space on the flow. Everything that can be abbreviated should be.

Next, notice what's NOT on the flow. The definitions usually don't need flowing unless you hear something crazy. If you're listening as the negative and you don't hear anything crazy in the definition, then you probably won't challenge it anyway. What's the use of writing this down if you're not going to make anything out of it? Just write down the words that the 1A defined, in case they left one out. You can always get the exact definitions from the copy of the 1AC that the 2NC will ask for in cross-examination anyway, if you do suddenly think up a topicality argument based on word definitions.

Something else not on the flow: all the planks of the plan. Only the mandates are flowed. The mandates are what the plan actually does, everything else being details that are in most plans. Again, unless you hear something crazy in one of them, it usually isn't worth the space to write down facts like their "agency" is "Congress and the State Department." A big part of skillful flowing is knowing what to write and what to leave out. Write the important stuff and leave out the things that aren't going to matter.

Notice what *is* on the flow: The entire outline of the 1AC. Anyone looking at this column can quickly figure out that they had three harms, one inherency argument, a plan to stop giving money to African governments and redirect it only to NGO's, and three advantages. And you should have a short summary of what those arguments are. If your flow doesn't give you the essential facts described in this paragraph, your flow isn't good enough and you need more practice flowing.

What happens next? Many would say, "Well, the 1NC gets up and speaks and everyone flows what she says." Not quite. The next thing that happens is that the 1N "pre-flows" her upcoming speech. "Pre-flowing" is a technique used by winning debaters that often separates them from the novices. It means that the 1N is going to write down short summaries of what her arguments will be in the 1NC during the 1AC, during the prep time between 1AC and 1NC, and while her partner is conducting the cross-examination of the 1AC.

Pre-flowing accomplishes two goals: First, it gives the 1N an outline of what she is going to say so that she can remember all the arguments she wants to make and can give an accurate summary at the start of the speech. Second, it means she has her own speech on the flow for the rest of the round. Since you cannot flow and speak at the same time, this is the best and sometimes only way to have a flow of your own speeches. This is essential because in rebuttal you will need to refer back to what you said in constructives, and if you haven't flowed your own speech, you will not be able to do that.

Unit I: Structure of Policy Debate

Never, ever go to the lectern in a policy debate with an empty column under your name on the flow. If you are the 1N, your 1NC flow should be filled out before you get up there. If it isn't, go back and sit down, because you are not ready to give your speech. The same goes for all the other speeches.

The pre-flow done by the 1N will be similar to the real-time flow taken by the other debaters: a list of summarized and abbreviated references to the 1NC arguments, similar to the 1AC flow. Let's suppose that the 1N plans to make the following arguments (summarized here for brevity; in real life she would have to completely explain them and read all the evidence for them):

Harms:

- 1) Civil wars in Africa are under control and reducing today.
- 2) 97% of aid reaches the poor today.
- 3) Terrorists aren't getting US aid money.

Inherency:

- 1) US State Department has announced new tighter controls on foreign aid.
- 2) African governments are behaving more responsibly.

The diagram below shows how the flow will appear after the 1NC:

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
I. DEF Signif, aid, foreign II. INH US=\$10B/yr to Afr govts III. HARMS 1. civil war 2. elites steal \$ 3. terrorism - payoffs from govt officials IV. PLAN All Afr aid thru NGO's V. ADV 1. ↓civil wars 2. poor get \$ 3. ↓\$ to terror	INH 1. Tighter ctrls on aid 9/06 2. Afr govts behavior↑2/07 HARMS 1. civil wars↓ 2. 97% aid gets to poor 3. terr not getting aid \$						

Notice a few additional features of the 1NC flow. First, we can draw arrows that connect related material across from the 1AC. We did that under the harms arguments above, and the need for these arrows will become more apparent as the flow progresses. We didn't do it with the inherency arguments because the negative's inherency evidence does not directly relate to the 1AC's inherency observation. Negative is raising new issues about controls and behavior changes, but they are not disputing 1AC's claim that the US gives \$10 billion/year in aid to African governments. These get flowed as inherency arguments, but they can't be linked with an arrow back to a 1AC argument.

Lesson 3: Flowing

Second, note again the abbreviations that appear in the 1NC column. These are similar to the abbreviations we used to represent the 1AC material. But we added one additional feature: notice the 9/06 and 2/07 next to the inherency arguments. These are the dates of those cards, and we notate them because the dates on these cards could become important issues in the round.

You might be wondering why we left the bottom half of the 1NC column blank. It seems like a lot of wasted space that could have been used to write out more complete information about the 1N's arguments. But there's a good reason for leaving it blank: The 2NC is probably going to make solvency arguments and/or disadvantages. These will be flowed against the plan and its advantages at the bottom of the flow. We are leaving the bottom of the flow open so that 2N's arguments can be written on the same flow with everything else and we will not be writing arguments on top of each other or in the margins after 2NC.

The cross-examination of the 1N by the 1A will follow, and the 2A will begin pre-flowing his next speech. Here we need to illustrate another flowing feature that can be extremely useful: flowing material generated during cross-examination. Cross-examination does not need to be flowed, which is why there are no columns on the flow for it. So, how, why, and when do we make notes about something that occurs in cross-ex?

The first indication on the flow of something that occurred in cross-examination will be a pre-flow notation made by the examiner's partner about something that the examiner was able to squeeze from her opponent that can be used to support her argument in the upcoming speech. In the current example, let's suppose the cross-examination of the 1N went like this:

Q. Now on your first harm card about 97% of the aid gets to the poor. Is that talking about US foreign aid in general or specifically aid to Africa?

A. I think that card's talking about US foreign aid in general.

Q. OK, thanks.

The 2A, as soon as he hears this, will pre-flow the letters "cx" and "not specifically Africa" in his 2AC column as a reminder to give this as a response to the 1N harms argument. He puts the "cx" notation to remind himself to say that this was something the other team admitted under cross-examination.

The 2A will pre-flow the rest of his 2AC in similar manner as that used by the 1N (using evidence and full explanations, not the quick summaries below), so let's summarize his arguments and see how they would appear on the flow:

Inherency:

- 1) Controls on US aid are not effective 12/15, updating Neg 9/06 card.
- 2) African governments wasting aid money despite reforms.

Unit I: Structure of Policy Debate

Harms:

- 1) Civil wars killed 3 million in Africa over the last 3 years.
- 2) IN admitted in CX that his card is about US aid programs in general, not specifically Africa.
- 3) IN's card wasn't talking about African-based terrorist groups and didn't mention the groups our 1A card mentioned.

For reasons of space, we've again greatly simplified this constructive by putting only the outline of what would appear in it above. These would appear on the flow as illustrated in the diagram below:

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
I. DEF Signif, aid, foreign II. INH US=\$10B/yr to Afr govts III. HARMS 1. civil war → 2. elites steal \$ → 3. terrorism - payoffs from govt officials → IV. PLAN All Afr aid thru NGO's V. ADV 1. ↓civil wars 2. poor get \$ 3. ↓\$ to terror	INH 1. Tighter ctrls on aid 9/06 → 2. Afr govts behavior ↑ 2/07 → HARMS 1. civil wars ↓ → 2. 97% aid gets to poor → 3. terr not getting aid \$ →	INH 1. Ctrls not working 12/06 2. Afr govts wasting \$ despite reform HARMS 1. 3m died 2. cx Not specif Afr 3. ≠ same terr groups in 1A					

(Note the equal sign with the line through it, indicating “not equal” or “isn't” in the third harm argument in 2AC—another cute space-saving device.)

As promised, the 2N will bring up solvency arguments and disadvantages in the next speech. Here's a quick summary of her arguments along with the flow after 2NC is finished. Keep in mind that the process for developing and delivering the 2NC is the same as the other two non-scripted constructives we have seen already: pre-flow during prep time and cross-examination, and use the pre-flow as the outline for the speech up at the podium.

Disadvantages:

- 1) Economic decline caused by socialist ideology promoted by NGOs in Africa.
- 2) Cultural violations and loss of self-determination when outside agencies tell native peoples how to improve their lives.

Solvency:

- 1) NGOs waste as much money as African governments.
- 2) NGOs cannot prevent money from getting to terrorists.

Let's see how these would be flowed in the 2NC's column:

Lesson 3: Flowing

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
I. DEF Signif, aid, foreign II. INH US=\$10B/yr to Afr govts III. HARMS 1. civil war → 2. elites steal \$ → 3. terrorism – payoffs from govt officials IV. PLAN All Afr aid thru NGO's V. ADV 1. ↓civil wars 2. poor get \$ 3. ↓\$ to terror	INH 1. Tighter ctrls on aid 9/06 → 2. Afr govts → behavior ↑2/07 HARMS 1. civil wars ↓ 2. 97% aid → gets to poor 3. terr not → getting aid \$	INH 1. Ctrls not working 12/06 2. Afr govts wasting \$ despite reform HARMS 1. 3m died 2. cx Not specif Afr groups in 1A	DA 1. econ NGO socialism 2. self determ SOLV 1. NGOs waste \$ 2. NGOs can't stop terr \$				

Flowing the Rebuttals

With the 1NR, rebuttals begin and arguments get shorter and simpler because no new arguments are being introduced—the debaters are only responding in a short period of time to material already in the round. The 1N, because she has carefully studied *Blue Book* Lesson 3, will give a line-by-line response to the 2AC and will not waste any time repeating what her partner said in 2NC:

Inherency:

- 1) Look back at our 1NC card—it says the US State Department is already imposing tighter controls!
- 2) Even if African governments are still wasting money, they are wasting less than they used to and it will be even less in the future as the reforms have more time to take effect.

Harms:

- 1) The evidence didn't say those 3 million that died were in civil wars caused by US foreign aid, nor did their solvency evidence say how many of those 3 million would have been saved by this plan.
- 2) The 97% card shows that the status quo has adequate controls in place, since the controls are working on a general basis. There's nothing stopping those controls from working in Africa like they do everywhere else.
- 3) Our card was referring to all terrorist groups in Africa not getting US money. It doesn't have to specifically list each one.

Unit I: Structure of Policy Debate

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
I. DEF Signif, aid, foreign II. INH US=\$10B/yr to Afr govts III. HARMS 1. civil war 2. elites steal \$ 3. terrorism - payoffs from govt officials IV. PLAN All Afr aid thru NGO's V. ADV 1. ↓civil wars 2. poor get \$ 3. ↓\$ to terror	INH 1. Tighter ctrls on aid 9/06 2. Afr govts behavior ↑2/07 HARMS 1. civil wars ↓ 2. 97% aid gets to poor 3. terr not getting aid \$	INH 1. Ctrls not working 12/06 2. Afr govts wasting \$ despite reform HARMS 1. 3m died 2. cx Not specif Afr 3. ≠ same terr groups in 1A	DA 1. econ NGO socialism 2. self determ SOLV 1. NGOs waste \$ 2. NGOs can't stop terr \$	INH 1. LWIS 2. Trend ↑ reform will work HARMS 1. ①≠caused by aid ②no specif solv ev 2. shows ctrls work 3. all terr groups			

Notice two new markings in the 1NR flow. The first inherency response was abbreviated on this flow (not by the 1N himself!) as “LWIS.” Unfortunately, the 1N made the beginner’s mistake of merely repeating what she said earlier rather than responding to the 2AC’s evidence. Rather than trying to re-write or summarize a worthless blurb like that, a clever affirmative (and perhaps the judge) will abbreviate it as LWIS, which stands for “look what I said (LWIS) back in the earlier speech.” It means she gave no real response and just repeated what she or her partner said earlier. All it takes is four letters to remind the affirmative of that on a flow.

Notice also the circled “1” and “2” on the first harm argument. These are sub-points to the first harm argument indicating she gave two separate responses to the 2AC’s argument. It is important to label these separately because if 1AR does not notice that he gave two responses, and only replies to one of them, the 2NR will pounce on that mistake, tell the judge about the other response, and claim victory on that argument.

We now expect the 1AR to cover, however briefly, all the issues in the round. As noted in Lesson 2, the 1AR is the most difficult speech in the round. He has only five minutes to cover 13 minutes of negative speaking. But thankfully, a good 1A has a clear flowsheet to keep him on track! He should be able to see exactly what was run in the negative block—both in the 2NC and the 1NR—and address every single argument. It won’t be easy, but let’s see what the 1AR says in the summary below:

Disadvantages:

- 1) Socialism corrupting poor nations’ economies is not unique because most of these countries already have messed-up economies anyway. They can’t get much poorer than they already are.
- 2) Loss of self-determination through outside intervention should not be a voting issue in the round because the

Lesson 3: Flowing

Negative team gave no impact to it. So what if they lose some self-determination? If we save lives, they can live long enough to worry about it later.

Solvency:

- 1) The Negative's card about NGOs wasting money was about one bad organization, not about NGOs in general.
- 2) Our expert said NGO money was less likely to get into terrorists' hands than it would be if it were going to governments. We're only claiming a reduction, not 100% guarantee that terrorists never get money.

Inherency:

- 1) No clear response to 2AC, just repeated INC argument.
- 2) Our card that status quo reforms aren't working updates their card about the trend of improvement today.

Harms:

- 2) The evidence may show that controls are working in some places, but it doesn't prove anything about what's happening in Africa, like our evidence does.
- 3) Here's more evidence from Prof. Joe Balladucci, Big University, 2012: "US government aid to African governments often finds its way into the hands of the terrorists due to widespread official corruption."

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
I. DEF Signif, aid, foreign II. INH US=\$10B/yr to Afr govts III. HARMS 1. civil war 2. elites steal \$ 3. terrorism - payoffs from govt officials IV. PLAN All Afr aid thru NGO's V. ADV 1. ↓civil wars 2. poor get \$ 3. ↓\$ to terror	INH 1. Tighter ctrls on aid 9/06 2. Afr govts behavior ↑2/07 HARMS 1. civil wars ↓ 2. 97% aid gets to poor 3. terr not getting aid \$	INH 1. Ctrls not working 12/06 2. Afr govts wasting \$ despite reform HARMS 1. 3m died 2. cx Not specif Afr 3. ≠ same terr groups in 1A	DA 1. econ NGO socialism 2. self determ SOLV 1. NGOs waste \$ 2. NGOs can't stop terr \$	INH 1. LWIS 2. Trend ↑ reform will work HARMS 1. ①≠caused by aid ②no specif solv ev 2. shows ctrls work 3. all terr groups	INH 1. just LWIS! 2. 2AC card updates HARMS 2. Ctrls may work but not in Afr 3. \$ to terr thru officials DA 1. not uniq alrdy poor 2. no impact SOLV 1. just 1 NGO 2. ↓\$ not 100% solv		

By now you know what to expect on the flow, based on the arguments the 1AR made. Notice one thing in particular here: that ugly empty space under the heading "HARMS." The 1A forgot or ran out of time to respond to the first harms argument that the negative team made. You can see how all the other arguments from earlier in the debate are being carried across the flow with arrows into the 1AR, and we expect those arrows to continue "flowing" across the page until the end of the 2AR.

Let's see what the 2NR does next. Here's a quick summary of what the 2NR will say:

Inherency

- 1) Cross-apply our second harm response where we gave evidence that controls are working and 97% of the aid gets to the poor. I'll have more to say on that under Harms.
- 2) Even if their evidence was more recent, our source was better qualified and had more experience with aid projects in Africa.

Unit I: Structure of Policy Debate

Harms

- 1) They dropped our two responses to the first harm about civil wars. This harm is now out of the round.
- 2) Affirmative never proved what's different about Africa to show why the controls wouldn't work there as well as in the rest of the world.
- 3) The 1AR evidence didn't quantify how much money was going to terrorist groups in Africa. It could be a very insignificant amount.

Disadvantages

- 1) The uniqueness is that even if they are poor now, they will either get into worse poverty or else get policies that guarantee they stay poor even as other countries that don't adopt socialism get richer through trade and economic integration.
- 2) Self-determination is the right of every ethnic and national group of people. Denying self-determination has the impact of denying basic human rights.

Solvency

- 1) Our evidence shows one example of an NGO that wastes money. It doesn't prove that this is the only NGO that has this problem. It proves that NGOs are not necessarily more efficient than government aid programs.
- 2) Affirmative never shows that whatever small percentage reduction they might achieve in funding to terrorism would reduce actual terrorist incidents. In other words, there's really no proven impact even if they do achieve some percentage reduction in funding.

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
I. DEF Signif, aid, foreign II. INH US=\$10B/yr to Afr govts III. HARMS 1. civil war 2. elites steal \$ 3. terrorism - payoffs from govt officials IV. PLAN All Afr aid thru NGO's V. ADV 1. ↓civil wars 2. poor get \$ 3. ↓\$ to terror	INH 1. Tighter ctrls on aid 9/06 2. Afr govts behavior ↑2/07 HARMS 1. civil wars ↓ 2. 97% aid gets to poor 3. terr not getting aid \$	INH 1. Ctrls not working 12/06 2. Afr govts wasting \$ despite reform HARMS 1. 3m died 2. cx Not specif Afr 3. ≠ same terr groups in 1A	DA 1. econ NGO socialism 2. self determ SOLV 1. NGOs waste \$ 2. NGOs can't stop terr \$	INH 1. LWIS 2. Trend ↑ reform will work HARMS 1. ①≠caused by aid ②no specif solv ev 2. shows ctrls work 3. all terr groups	INH 1. just LWIS! 2. 2AC card updates HARMS 2. Ctrls may work but not in Afr 3. \$ to terr thru officials DA 1. not uniq alrdy poor 2. no impact SOLV 1. just 1 NGO 2. ↓\$ not 100% solv	INH 1. x-apply H2 2. better qual xpert HARMS 1. Drop! 2. No explain why not Afr 3. How much \$? DA 1. can't improve 2. self-det =human right SOLV 1. example 2. ↓\$=↓terr	

Notice a few things about the 2NR flow. First, 2NR used the term “cross-apply” to give a better response to the first inherency argument instead of LWIS again. “Cross-apply” (abbreviated “x-apply” on the flow) means to use the same response for two different arguments because the same evidence or logical reply will equally apply to both. Here, the 2N believes that her response to the second harm argument (abbreviated “H2” in the inherency part of the flow) will also be adequate to answer the first inherency argument. So, she simply tells the judge to cross-apply her second harm argument as also being the response to the first inherency argument. This neatly saves her some time in rebuttal by using one response to accomplish two things.

Lesson 3: Flowing

Notice also at the first harms argument that the 2N simply points out (correctly) that the affirmative dropped this argument and then moves on. She does not waste time belaboring this point excessively. There's no need: If everyone is flowing accurately, they can easily see that 1AR dropped it and that the issue is now pretty much going to flow negative.

Now we come to the 2AR's responses to the 2NR. Here's a quick summary, but first notice that the speaker may choose to address the issues in a different order from that of the previous speaker, based on what he thinks is most important:

Disadvantages

- 1) The poverty disadvantage is still not unique because people are stuck in poverty no matter what happens. If NGO socialism keeps them poor then they'll stay poor, but if the status quo rip-offs of aid continue, they'll continue to be poor too. Poverty is simply not a reason to vote Negative in this round.
- 2) Self-determination is impossible to achieve: Mashy Niblock, BANFF REVIEW, 2007: "African countries have little hope of self-determination no matter what the West does. For the foreseeable future, they will be wards of the developed world and continue to depend on aid for basic survival."

Solvency

- 1) The card did not say it was giving one example among many NGOs that waste money. It was simply citing one NGO that had a problem. It doesn't say that lots of others have the same problem.
- 2) Our 1AC evidence said it was beneficial to reduce dollars going to terrorists; we don't need to read anymore cards on that.

Harms

- 1) Regardless of how you vote on the harm card on civil wars, they dropped our 1AC solvency evidence that says civil wars would go down if you vote for our plan. That's enough to justify an Affirmative ballot.
- 2) On controls not working, they said we didn't explain why they don't work in Africa. We don't have to; our evidence did it for us. They keep ignoring the stacks of evidence we read and just keep asking "why?" Ultimately it doesn't matter why, as long as we solve for it.
- 3) How much money is going to terrorists from corrupt officials? First of all, the fact he now admits that this is happening at least some of the time contradicts his response on Harm 2 about not knowing whether controls are working—now we agree that they don't. Second, our 1AC evidence said it was a significant problem. If the experts who have looked at this say it's a significant problem, then not knowing the exact dollar value has no impact on the round.

Inherency

- 1) He cross-applies Harm 2, so cross-apply my responses to Harm 2 here.
- 2) We update them but they claim their expert is better qualified. There was nothing wrong with our expert on this, and more importantly, on this issue, timing is the important factor. This is about inherency, regarding what the status quo is doing, and our more recent evidence showed that the status quo is failing to solve. Their expert may have been great, but things have changed since he said what he did.

Down below, you can see how the flow will look after the 2AR:

Unit I: Structure of Policy Debate

1AC	1NC	2AC	2NC	1NR	1AR	2NR	2AR
I. DEF Signif, aid, foreign	INH 1. Tighter ctrls on aid 9/06	INH 1. Ctrls not working 12/06		INH 1. LWIS	INH 1. just LWIS!	INH 1. x-apply H2	INH 1. x-apply H2
II. INH US=\$10B/yr to Afr govts	2. Afr govts behavior ↑ 2/07	2. Afr govts wasting \$ despite reform		2. Trend ↑ reform will work	2. 2AC card updates	2. better qual xpert	2. date ↑ import
III. HARMS 1. civil war	HARMS 1. civil wars ↓	HARMS 1. 3m died		HARMS 1. ① ≠ caused by aid	HARMS 2. Ctrls may work but not in Afr	HARMS 1. Drop!	HARMS 1. Still get Adv1
2. elites steal \$	2. 97% aid gets to poor	2. cx Not specif Afr		② no specif solv ev	3. \$ to terr thru officials	2. No explain why not Afr	2. Ignored our evid
3. terrorism - payoffs from govt officials	3. terr not getting aid \$	3. ≠ same terr groups in 1A		2. shows ctrls work		3. How much \$?	3. ① contrad H2
IV. PLAN All Afr aid thru NGO's			DA 1. econ NGO socialism	3. all terr groups	DA 1. not uniq alrly poor	DA 1. can't improve	② exp say signif \$ DA
V. ADV 1. ↓ civil wars			2. self deter		2. no impact	2. self-det =human right	1. SQ rip offs = pov
2. poor get \$					SOLV 1. just 1 NGO	SOLV 1. example	2. self-det impossible
3. ↓ \$ to terror					2. ↓ \$ not 100% solv	2. ↓ \$ = ↓ terr	SOLV 1. only 1 2. see 1AC

The flow is now complete. It was a useful tool during the round, but its usefulness does not end at that point. Some debaters fail to flow the 2AR because they don't realize that a flow's benefits are not confined to the immediate round. In the competitive season when you're going from tournament to tournament, you will use these flows to prepare for the next tournament.

If it was a negative round, take the outline of the affirmative case and prepare a negative brief from it. Use the evidence summaries as a starting point to do research on the claims the affirmative made and develop more evidence to defeat this case if you encounter it again. Remember that there may be other teams using the same case, so don't assume that it only applies to the one team you heard in this one round.

If it was an affirmative round, look at the negative arguments that gave you trouble. Go do more research and either improve your 1AC or save the evidence for use in the 2AC or 1AR to refute the things negatives are bringing up against you.

In debate club, you may share your negative flows with your friends. They, too, can start preparing for those tough affirmative cases you came up against in competition. Clubs that review negative flows together can often think of powerful arguments that didn't come up during the round. Everyone can be better prepared next time they go negative against the same plan.

Worksheet for Lesson 3A

Name: _____ Date: _____

Read Lesson 3 through the constructive speeches. Answer the following questions in the spaces provided.

1. Fill out and take note of the following, taken from the introduction of Lesson 3:

Flowing is the process of _____ a well-organized, legible
_____ of all the _____ made by all the debaters in the
_____ and _____, including _____
_____.

2. In the first two lessons, do you feel you have grasped the importance of flowing? Explain.

3. When the 1AC is finished with his speech, who in the room should have the first column filled out?

Circle all that apply: 1A 2A 1N 2N The judge

4. Explain why debaters typically do not write down the definitions other than just the words that are being defined. Include in your answer when it would be appropriate to write down the full definition.

5. Why aren't most of the specifics of the plan written down? What one specific is always written down?

6. Explain the concept of pre-flowing. Is it ever appropriate to approach the lectern without your speech pre-flowed?

7. The cross-examinations do not need to be flowed on a debater's flowsheet. Why is this the case?

8. In the example above, what two major classifications of arguments did the 2NC bring up that are new arguments on the flow?

a)

b)

9. Which of the following does *not* need to pre-flow their upcoming speech?

Circle: 1A 2A 1N 2N The judge

Worksheet for Lesson 3B

Name: _____ Date: _____

Read Lesson 3 through the rebuttal speeches. Answer the following questions in the spaces provided.

1. Fill out and take note of the following, taken from the introduction of the rebuttal speeches from Lesson 3:

With the 1NR, rebuttals begin and arguments get _____ and
_____ because no _____ are being
introduced—the debaters are only _____ in a short period of time to material
already in the round.

2. Explain what the abbreviation LWIS stands for and why it is a useful strategy on your flowsheet.

3. Why should a debater signify sub-points with circled numbers on their flowsheet?

4. Why is the 1AR the most difficult speech in the round? How does flowing help make this speech effective?

5. What does it mean to “cross-apply” an argument? What is the abbreviation that debaters use to show this on the flow?

6. How much time should a debater take showing a dropped argument?

7. Explain why a flow should be completed to the very end and why debaters should hold onto their flowsheets after the round.

Extension for Lesson 3

Once again, return to the video debate at [MonumentPublishing.com/bluebook-lesson1](https://www.monumentpublishing.com/bluebook-lesson1), or if your teacher provides another video, return to that. Watch the video and flow the debate round using a flowsheet. Be sure to follow the format provided in this chapter.