

# BEFORE WE GET STARTED

**Register your  
attendance.**

Session 313

**Advanced LD: Concepts &  
Strategies**



SCAN HERE FOR  
HOUSTON ROSTERS

LONE STAR COLLEGE- NORTH HARRIS, HOUSTON



**ADVANCED LD DEBATE**  
**TECHNIQUES & STRATEGIES**

STEPHEN GREEN

**Use OBSERVATIONS to narrow the ground on affirmative & expand it for the negative .**

**RESOLVED:** In the United States, agroecology ought to be prioritized over industrial agriculture.

**Use OBSERVATIONS to narrow the ground on affirmative & expand it for the negative .**

# AFF

**Observation:** “Prioritized” means that we **should only be considering** times when you cannot achieve both at the same time. It also does not mean elimination.

Use **OBSERVATIONS** to narrow the ground on affirmative & expand it for the negative .

# NEG

**Observation:** The U.S. government has a moral obligation to **only enact policies that are pragmatic** in the status quo. It isn't moral to demand the impossible.

**Use DEFINITIONS to narrow & expand the debate as well.**

RESOLVED: In the United States, **agroecology** ought to be prioritized over industrial agriculture.

“a **holistic approach** to agriculture that integrates **principles of ecology, culture, economics, and society** to create **sustainable and equitable farming systems.**”

“a set of **farming practices** that emphasize **organic methods** and **small-scale production.**”

**Attack the opponent's most important elements by LAYERING arguments.**

value **environmental sustainability**

criterion **minimizing long-term environmental and social harm**

contention 1

**agroecology promotes long-term environmental sustainability**

contention 2

**agroecology advances economic equity**

contention 3

**agroecology enhances food security**

**Attack the opponent's most important elements by LAYERING arguments.**

argument 1 **environmental sustainability neglects human welfare**

argument 2 **environmental sustainability impedes technology progress**

argument 3 **environmental sustainability is unrealistic and impractical**

argument 4 **environmental sustainability causes economic inefficiency**

argument 5 **environmental sustainability conflicts with cultural values**



**Don't waste time on UNIMPORTANT arguments, or those the JUDGE BOUGHT already.**

value **environmental sustainability**

criterion **minimizing long-term environmental and social harm**

contention 1

**agroecology promotes long-term environmental sustainability**

contention 2

**agroecology advances economic equity**

contention 3

**agroecology enhances food security**

**Save time by GROUPING arguments sharing a warrant and/or impact .**

contention 3 **agroecology enhances food security**

subpoint a

**increases resilience to climate change**

subpoint b

**local food systems & reduced dependency**

subpoint c

**promotes sustainable resource use**

subpoint d

**empowers small scale farmers**

subpoint e

**provides diverse nutrition**

**Save time by GROUPING arguments sharing a warrant and/or impact .**

contention 3 **agroecology enhances food security**

subpoint a

**increases resilience to climate change**

subpoint b

**local food systems & reduced dependency**

subpoint c

**promotes sustainable resource use**

subpoint d

**empowers small scale farmers**

subpoint e

**provides diverse nutrition**

Save time by **GROUPING arguments** sharing a warrant **and/or** impact .

contention 3 **agroecology enhances food security**

subpoint a

increases resilience to climate change

subpoint b

local food systems & reduced dependency

subpoint c

promotes sustainable resource use

subpoint d

empowers small scale farmers

subpoint a

provides diverse nutrition

response 1

**When in conflict, quantity matters over quality. Affirming can cause food insecurity in shortage situations.**

response 2

**Ensuring food security can come at the cost of biodiversity, which is required for environmental stability.**

## Read **the judge** paradigms and follow **it. PLEASE, y'all!**

**Speed:** I hate it. Debate is supposed to be an event of not only logic and evidence, but persuasion. Take time to help me understand why I care so much.

### **LD Debate**

I am a traditional, value-debate judge. This means I want to see a clash of either which value is best, or who upholds it more. I want why your value matters more.

Values and criterion **MUST** link. The value must be met through the lens of the criterion.

Then, I want to see how the contention-level framework proves you meet your criterion and therefore the value.

K's pretty much don't exist in LD. They are either observations or contentions. If you run a K, you **CANNOT** attack the on-case.

Don't run a plan. Not that I won't accept it, but LD is a **WHY** should we, not a **HOW** should we debate. This is especially true in resolutions with no timeframe nor location frame.

**NO PARADIGM: Ask.**

“Hi, judge. Before the round starts, I noticed you didn’t have one on Tabroom and wanted to ask what your paradigm is.”

**LAY JUDGES: No jargon. Keep simple. Speak pretty.**

**Ensuring food security** can come at the **cost** of **biodiversity**, a **key component** of environmental **sustainability**.

**LAY JUDGES: No jargon. Keep simple. Speak pretty.**

**Making sure everyone has enough food** can sometimes mean **harming** the **variety of plants and animals in nature**, which is **important** for **keeping** our environment **healthy**.



**COACH JUDGES: Paradigm. Paradigm. Paradigm.**

**PARADIGM:** Values and criterion MUST link.

**ORIGINAL:** \*Just presents the value and criterion but doesn't specifically describe the connection.\*

**ADD:** “**Minimizing long-term environmental and social harm** is the **best criterion** for **environmental sustainability** because it ensures that we **protect natural resources** and **maintain the well-being of communities** for **future** generations, creating a **balanced approach** that **supports both** needs **over time**. **Without protection, sustainability is impossible.**”

**NON-LAY, HIRED JUDGES: Paradigm. Paradigm. Paradigm.**

**PARADIGM: Don't run a plan.** Not that I won't accept it, but LD is a WHY should we, not a HOW should we debate.

**ORIGINAL:** Negative runs a **counterplan, attacks your case**, and says: "Because the **affirmative doesn't have a way to solve** these problems in the status quo, **we have no way to know** if there are harms in affirming."

**SAY:** "My opponent claims **we can't debate unless I have a plan, but attacked my case anyway**, proving there's ground for debate. There's also **no reason the opponent's plan can't exist in the affirmative** world (assuming). Finally, **LD is about debating the concept, not the execution of the concept.** We are here to know that, **generally speaking**, is agroecology a better approach than industrial agriculture."

**Use an IMPACT CALCULUS to weigh the round using your framework .**

## **timeframe**

which is more important: short-term or long-term?  
who does it better?

## **scope**

who affects more people/things?

## **magnitude**

who affects the things deeper?

**Use cross examination to CLARIFY & go on the OFFENSE .**

**NEG:** “Ensuring food security can come at the cost of biodiversity, a key component of environmental sustainability.”

**AFF: “You argue that ensuring food security harms biodiversity. How does that happen?”**

“When we focus on food security, particularly on producing enough food to feed a growing population, it often requires converting natural habitats into farmland, which reduces the variety of species and disrupts ecosystems.”

**“But don’t agroecological systems actually work to preserve or even enhance biodiversity while still producing sufficient food?”**

**Use cross examination to CLARIFY & go on the OFFENSE .**

“Sure, but even sustainable practices can’t meet global food demands without some impact on biodiversity.”

**“Isn’t industrial agriculture more likely to harm biodiversity because of its reliance on monocultures and chemical inputs compared to agroecological methods that use crop diversity and natural processes?”**

“You can argue that. However, agroecological methods struggle to meet food security goals compared with industrial agriculture.”

**“So, your argument is about the implementation rather than a problem with the concept of agroecology?”**

**Use cross examination to CLARIFY & go on the OFFENSE .**

“Agroecology may be nice in theory, but the scale needed to achieve global food security might still push agroecological practices to prioritize yields.”

**“But if we focus on true agroecological methods, isn’t the goal to minimizing the environmental impact? Wouldn’t a practical agroecological system be the best approach to balance?”**

“Agroecology is better for biodiversity only in a concept. It fails when there’s not enough food. You have to prove that it is possible.”

**“So, you’re saying agroecology is good for biodiversity in theory, but not in reality?”**

**Use cross examination to CLARIFY & go on the OFFENSE .**

“Right. If the situation happens where we come down to the choice between sustainable practices versus needing to eat, we have to pick the option that keeps us alive.”

**“Isn’t the purpose of agroecology quite literally about promoting sustainability, though? Like, isn’t that the point?”**

“There are lots of things that work in concept, but not when we see it happen in the real world.”

**“OK, so give me a time when a true agroecological failed because it couldn’t produce enough food.”**

## If they spread & card dump , GROUP the arguments & break the LINK CHAIN .

contention 2 agroecology causes extinction

subpoint a **agroecology reduces food reduction capacity**

subpoint b **reduction leads to global food shortages**

subpoint c **food shortages cause global instability**

subpoint d **global instability leads to nuclear war**

subpoint e **nuclear winter leads to mass extinction**

response **A agroecological effort would create demand for plans that can be truly sustainable. Necessity breeds innovation.**

response **Nothing is ever written in stone. We can generally prioritize agroecological practices and pivot in emergency situations. I don't prioritize using a fire extinguisher, but I do when I have to.**

response **So does war, inflation, natural disasters, dictatorships, pandemics. This argument is nonunique at best.**

response **We have had global instability including right now. Why aren't the nukes flying? Who presses the button first?**

response **Only for a certain threshold of nuclear activity. Plus, the Earth has undergone versions of this with and without humans and survived.**



## READ. THEIR. EVIDENCE. (You have the right.)

### High-yield crops key to food security. [U.S. Department of State, 2023](#)

The United States has long been at the forefront of tackling global food insecurity, and we remain steadfast in our leadership through our focus on two crucial dimensions: immediate emergency response and long-term strategies for sustainable productivity.

Global food demand will increase by more than 50 percent in 2050, but due to climate change, agriculture yields of major crops could decrease over that same period. This dangerous combination could lead to price spikes, food insecurity, social unrest, political tensions, and conflict.

We will never achieve food security without fertile soils and adapted and productive crops. The United States is providing an initial \$100 million through the Vision for Adapted Crops and Soils (VACS) program. As part of Feed the Future, VACS will initially focus on the African continent and will include mapping and analyzing soils, promoting better farm management, and mitigating drought effects. It will also foster crop varieties resilient to climate change, pests, extreme weather, and variable rainfall.

With this assistance, we are continuing to support critical agricultural development programs. We are also committed to partnering with the international community on food security initiatives that lead to nutritious adapted crops and healthy soils for sustainable agriculture.

**READ. THEIR. EVIDENCE.** (You have the right.)

## High-yield crops key to food security. [U.S. Department of State, 2023](#)

The United States has long been at the forefront of tackling global food insecurity, and we remain steadfast in our leadership through our focus on two crucial dimensions: immediate emergency response **and long-term strategies** for **sustainable** productivity.

Global food demand will increase by more than 50 percent in 2050, but due to climate change, agriculture yields of major crops could decrease over that same period. This dangerous combination could lead to price spikes, food insecurity, social unrest, political tensions, and conflict.

We will never achieve food security without **fertile soils and adapted and productive crops**. The United States is providing an initial \$100

million through the Vision for Adapted Crops and Soils (VACS) program. **As part of Feed the Future, VACS will initially focus on the African continent and will include mapping and analyzing soils, promoting better farm management, and mitigating drought effects. It will also foster crop varieties resilient to climate change, pests, extreme weather, and variable rainfall.**

With this assistance, **we are continuing to support** critical agricultural development programs. We are also committed to partnering with the

**international community on food security initiatives that lead to nutritious adapted crops and healthy soils for sustainable agriculture.**

**KRITIKS are reasons we can't debate the topic because of a bigger issue.**

## anthropocentrism inherent to agriculture prioritization

### LINK

The resolution assumes that the **primary goal of agricultural practices**, whether agroecological or industrial, **is to serve human needs**—specifically food security. **This anthropocentric viewpoint ignores the inherent value of ecosystems, non-human species, and natural processes.** By framing the debate around which human-centered agricultural system should be prioritized, the **resolution perpetuates a worldview that sees nature as a means to an end, rather than as an interconnected system with intrinsic worth.**

### IMPACT

**Anthropocentrism is at the root of many of the environmental crises** we face today, including **climate change, biodiversity loss, and ecological collapse.** By placing **human interests above all else**, we **disrupt natural systems**, leading to long-term consequences that **threaten all life on Earth, including humans.** The continuation of **anthropocentric thinking ensures that any so-called "sustainable" practices, like agroecology, are still fundamentally exploitative and inadequate to address the root causes of environmental degradation.** This mindset contributes to the destruction of ecosystems, the extinction of species, and the erosion of planetary health, ultimately leading to a future where both humans and non-humans suffer the consequences of a destabilized environment.

**KRITIKS are reasons we can't debate the topic because of a bigger issue.**

## anthropocentrism inherent to agriculture prioritization

### ALTERNATIVE

**Reject the anthropocentric framework entirely.** Instead of prioritizing one agricultural system over another, we should **adopt an ecocentric perspective that recognizes the intrinsic value of all living beings and ecosystems.** This approach **shifts the focus** from managing nature for human benefit **to coexisting with nature** in a way that honors and preserves the integrity of natural systems. By embracing an ecocentric worldview, we **move toward truly sustainable practices** that respect the rights and needs of non-human entities, ensuring the long-term health and balance of the planet.

### IMPACT

**Voting to affirm or negate the resolution** as it stands **reaffirms the anthropocentric framework that is the root cause of environmental issues.** Instead, the judge should reject the resolution in its entirety as an invalid and harmful proposition. By doing so, we challenge the underlying assumptions of the debate and open the door to more holistic, ecocentric approaches that can genuinely address the environmental challenges we face. **A vote against the resolution is a vote against anthropocentrism** and for a more sustainable and equitable relationship between humans and the natural world.

**Attack KRITIKS by addressing link, impact, alternative, intent and/or educational value.**

## **anthropocentrism inherent to agriculture prioritization**

### **LINK**

**Human existence is anthropocentric** because any time we eat — vegetables or meat — requires domination of life, which is inherently not biocentric. We accept an anthropocentric view is required, but argue there are ways to use agroecology to make our impact on the natural world as small as possible.

### **IMPACT**

**This is non-unique.** Climate change, biodiversity loss, and ecological collapse happen for 1,000 reasons. My opponent has to prove that every single agricultural practices has led to those impacts. Otherwise, it is not inherent to agricultural prioritization, particularly an agroecological one.

### **ALTERNATIVE**

Even the **alternative requires an anthropocentric worldview** as humans would still dominate all life or else we die because we can't eat.

**Attack KRITIKS by addressing link, impact, alternative, intent and/or educational value.**

## **anthropocentrism inherent to agriculture prioritization**

### **INTENT**

(**Assuming they also run negative arguments.**) The purpose of a kritik is to reject the resolution, as they mentioned, because of a larger issue. However, **they still ran a negative case.** This means that **they either disagree with their own kritik, or that they accept that the negative world is as harmful as the affirmative.** You vote affirmative on those reasons alone.

### **EDUCATIONAL VALUE (REVERSE K)**

There are a ton of problems in the world and we have been tasked with vetting the merits of agroecological and industrial agriculture practices. That's what everyone was tasked with and prepared for. **To reject this is to ruin the purpose of having a resolution in debate and distracts from resolving the resolution.** Otherwise, we can just reject the resolution to worm our way out of having a legitimate debate over real issues in favor of trying to win.

**Use ALL of your PREP TIME : clean the flow , breathe , refocus , research .**

- clean up your flow**
- clarify notes**
- outline the next speech**
- breathing exercises to calm nerves**
- drink water**
- refocus on larger strategies**
- read & research cards**
- ask for a copy of evidence**

# Pick up DROPS and state why they matter . “Silence is compliance.”

contention 2 agroecology causes extinction

subpoint a agroecology reduces food reduction capacity

subpoint b reduction leads to global food shortages

DROP

subpoint c food shortages cause global instability

subpoint d global instability leads to nuclear war

subpoint e nuclear winter leads to mass extinction

response A agroecological effort would create demand for plans that can be truly sustainable. Necessity breeds innovation.

response **Nothing is ever written in stone. We can generally prioritize agroecological practices and pivot in emergency situations. I don't prioritize using a fire extinguisher, but I do when I have to.**

response So does war, inflation, natural disasters, dictatorships, pandemics. This argument is nonunique at best.

response We have had global instability including right now. Why aren't the nukes flying? Who presses the button first?

response Only for a certain threshold of nuclear activity. Plus, the Earth has undergone versions of this with and without humans and survived.



## Pick up DROPS and state why they matter . “Silence is compliance.”

My opponent **dropped my argument** against their **contention 2 subpoint b** that **reduction leads to global food shortages** when I said “**nothing is ever written in stone. We can generally prioritize agroecological practices and pivot in emergency situations. I don’t prioritize using a fire extinguisher, but I do when I have to.**”

**In LD debate, silence means compliance.** This means if they didn’t respond, we have to assume **they agree with my response.** This means **they agree we can pivot** from agroecological practices **in emergencies while maintaining the overarching priority to agroecology.**

This means their **nuclear winter argument never comes to fruition** because we will **pivot to high-yield food production before global food shortages ever occur, preventing global instability, nuclear war, and nuclear winter.**

Furthermore, **turn their whole case for the affirmative** because **their harms (presumably) come from instances solved by pivoting practices to solve short-term problems.** This means we can **perm the negative position** by **alternating between** a long-term approach to agroecology and short-term fixes that may or may not include industrial agriculture.

**Drops are especially vital for** OBSERVATIONS & DEFINITIONS **as they limit the round.**

# AFF DROPS THIS NEG OBSERVATION

The U.S. government has a **moral obligation** to **only enact policies that are pragmatic** in the status quo. It **isn't moral** to demand the **impossible**.

“My opponent’s case **never proves that it is possible** to switch to an agroecological system, nor responds to **my arguments showing it’s impossible**. They **dropped the observation and agree** that it is **immoral** to demand things that are **impossible** and that **they have the burden to prove it is pragmatic**. **Because they agree to this burden**, you have no choice but to negate.”



**STEPHEN GREEN**

**SMGREEN@CONROEISD.NET**

# THANK YOU FOR ATTENDING



HOUSTON EVAL

## We value your feedback!

Please complete conference evaluation **after your last session.**



LONE STAR COLLEGE- NORTH HARRIS, HOUSTON