

This House Would (THW) – this is a **policy** motion. In these kinds of motions, the Proposition are arguing for passing a specific policy (usually to resolve a particular problem). In this kind of motion, the OG team generally has a lot of latitude in deciding *how* to do the policy – how it’s **meched**. This involves talking about who is doing the policy (usually the state), where it is happening (often place-limited to e.g. Western Liberal Democracies, though this is by no means set in stone), and how it’s going to be done, whether there are any (legitimate) exceptions to the policy, etc.

It’s common for Opposition teams in this format to offer Points of Clarification in order to make sure that the mechanism and definitions that the OG team are defending are clear. CG is bound by the mechanism that OG brings (in nearly all circumstances). In this kind of motion, Opening Opposition can decide what their alternative is and defend that, so long as it would not take up an unreasonable amount more resources to do than the Government policy.

This House Believes (THB) – this is an **analysis** motion. In this kind of motion, you generally don’t need to provide a mechanism. In this kind of motion you’re arguing for the truth or falsity of a particular statement. For example, a common Schools-level motion is “THB that single-sex schools are good for education”. In this motion, it’s Government’s burden to show why single-sex schools (as reasonably defined by them) are good (on whatever metric) for education (for some definition of education). Conversely, it’s Opposition’s burden to show the opposite: that single-sex schools are not good for education. Definitions are still important, but the motion doesn’t require a specific actor to be kept in mind.

One important caveat to this is in motions which being “This House believes that [x actor] *should* [do y]”, e.g. THBT the West should Militarily Intervene in Syria. This is phrased as an analysis motion, but for all intents and purposes it’s a policy motion and should be treated as one.

This House Regrets (THR) – regrets motions are, on face, a little tricky, but they're nothing to be too afraid of. They essentially ask the Proposition teams to give an account of the bad things about a certain event or trend, and then to suggest what the **counterfactual** might have been, i.e. what the world would have looked like if the event hadn't happened. For example, the motion "THR the rise of hook-up culture" asks Prop teams to give an account of what is wrong with a culture that normalises and glorifies casual sex without emotional commitment, and also to explain *why the world would have been better* had that culture not become a norm. Opposition teams, then, have to explain why the culture is beneficial and why the alternative would have been worse.

You can imagine regrets motions, in some ways, as reverse policy motions. In a policy motion, the Government says what the world looks like now, why it's bad, and why what they're doing will change it in a way that's good. In regrets motions, they say why the status quo is good, and why if a change *had not occurred*, the world would be a worse place.

This House Supports/Opposes (THS/THO) – these motions used to be quite rare, but they've become more commonplace in recent years. What they mean tends to be quite contextually dependent, but broadly:

THS motions tend to give you a concept or policy (e.g. "hook-up culture" or "the Iran nuclear deal") and ask the Government teams to explain why that concept, or its proliferation, might be a good thing. Conversely, they ask the Opposition teams to prove that it is a bad thing. This seems very simple, and it generally is.

THO motions are something like a "regrets" motion, set in the present tense. They give you a potential development or trend, and ask the Government teams to explain why that trend is bad or should be condemned, and the Opposition teams to explain either (a) why it should be supported or (b) why opposing it is not necessarily a good idea in and of itself.

This House, as X – actor motions often trip up debaters, even experienced ones. They differ from all other motions in one key respect: they ask you to consider the world from one specific point of view. In a policy/analysis/regrets debate, there is no single actor's interest which is inherently the most important. You can appeal to some overarching conception of the good, and

win. That means that e.g. in politics debates it's often not sufficient to say that a policy will get a party you like into power or stop a party you dislike from gaining power; instead, it tends to be more effective to say why a policy will make the political *system* or a *society* better.

In an actor debate, you have to consider the interests of the actor you've been assigned. So for example, in the debate "TH supports the Iran nuclear deal", you can take the position of anybody you like: you might think about the economic and geopolitical stability of the region, for example. If instead you get the motion "TH, as Israel, supports the Iran nuclear deal", you have to specifically consider *Israel's* interests. This obviously entails attempting to identify those interests, and a lot of the contention in an actor debate is likely to be over what specifically those interests are.