**How to attack/defend Rights in Debating**

When outlining Rights in debating, a three-step approach can be used:

1. **Explain what the Right is**. This is more than just naming the Right. Go into some detail of how the Right works, and what it is and isn’t, and the Rationale for such a Right to exist.
2. Connect the Right to the given context. From this **explain the Tangible Benefits that come out of this Right in the given context.** Without Tangible Benefits, invoking a Right is useless.
3. **Connect the Right and Tangible Outcomes back to the Model/Moot.** This might be very straightforward, or possibly more in-depth.

**Example: Moot is Mandatory Covid-19 Vaccinations.**

**Affirmative:**

1. Right of Security. People have the Right to be Safe, particularly from harms that they have no control over (War, violent crimes, global pandemics.) The government has a responsibility to try and provide this Right to its citizens, where possible.
2. Covid-19 is a highly infectious disease with a mortality rate of about 5%. It clearly is something people should have the Right to be protected from. Vaccines protect you from the virus, and everyone vaccinated would prevent the virus from spreading (herd immunity).
3. Then clearly mandatory vaccines will enable the Government to provide this Right. This would quickly provide herd immunity, and protect the population from the virus.

**Negating:**

1. Freedom of Choice. People should be allowed to make personal choices, particularly concerning things that affect them. This is tied to body autonomy, since the most appropriate person to make choices about one’s body is oneself.
2. Vaccines are not without risk. Individuals should be able to make an informed decision on whether or not to accept the vaccine. Since the vaccine has potentially deadly side effects, and are relatively new, individuals should hold the power to make the final decision on whether to get a vaccine. People know themselves the best, and should make the final choice regarding their own health.
3. Making vaccines mandatory takes away their Freedom of Choice. People would have no say whether to accept the vaccine, thus no say over their own health, and would be exposed to risk that they did not consent to.

**How to attack Rights**

Attacking Rights relies on finding the weak-point in their analysis. If your opponents haven’t completed steps 1, 2, or 3, then this is an obvious weak link.

* Remind the adjudicator of the premise of a Right. A Right is something that enables people to Flourish. It should lead to a tangible benefit.
* Without explaining step 1, the Right is open to wild interpretations, or is so vague that it could apply to anything.
* Without explaining step 2, the Right is either not addressing the context, or no tangible benefits are derived from it. Without tangible benefits, invoking the Right becomes pointless
* Without explaining step 3, the Right is not fully linked to the model/moot. The Tangible benefits may not be mutually exclusive, may be obtained other ways, and may be a complete Red Herring/Whataboutism.