

Debate Workshop - Framing

42 MIN · YOUTUBE · [HTTPS://WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/WATCH?V=53BKDY9TWMY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=53BKDY9TWMY)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=53Bkdy9tWMY>

SUMMARY

The lecture focuses on the concept of "framing" in debating, particularly for ESL speakers, emphasizing its importance as a creative and strategic tool to influence the outcome of debates. Framing involves contextualizing arguments to enhance one's position while limiting the opponent's effectiveness, making it a crucial skill for debaters.

- Framing is a contextualization that helps in winning debates, distinct from mere characterization.*
- Types of framing include "this is used rarely" and "this is used with good or bad incentives," which can amplify impacts and mitigate opposition arguments.*
- Analyzing the strength of actors in relation to each other can enhance arguments, demonstrating why one side has more power or incentive than the other.*
- The "tipping point" frame can be used to argue that a proposed change won't significantly alter the status quo due to existing barriers.*
- Framing narratives involves analyzing how societal narratives influence behavior, allowing for a nuanced debate on their impacts.*
- Caution is advised against over-reliance on framing, as it can detract from building substantive arguments.*
- Not all debates can be effectively framed, and judges may not always grasp complex framing, necessitating clear communication.*
- Experimentation with framing is encouraged, but a balanced approach with argument building is essential for success in debates.*

okay hello everyone welcome to uh today's Basics lecture which is on framing uh the secret weapon of ESL speakers uh the point of this lecture is to go over uh what is framing and multiple types of framing that you could utilize uh but ultimately I have to be honest this is a particularly hard Workshop to do because framing unlike anything everything else in debating is a particularly like unique creative thing

that can pop up through various forms uh in very different debates and it's kind of like truly the uh let's say final part of um of of debating in terms of like the skill set that you have uh so mastering it truly is um uh like the final feat and especially people who are able to come up with very creative framings that truly break debates or like push out arguments in totally different uh angles viewpoints and stuff like that

should be you know people that uh should be widely uh cherished let's use this word but like right they celebrate within uh debating in the game because they truly push the game to new and new uh new and New Concepts new and new places new and new thought process and things like that uh okay so what is framing basically the theoretical understanding of framing is that it is a contextualization or piece of context

[Music] are basically like the uh let's say the Baseline parameters of what we're debating so what we are arguing and what we're not arguing obviously they're kind of connected these two things but they shouldn't but framing is more contextualization that serves the purpose of us winning the debate more whereas like setting up the debate should be uh for the purposes of us having a clean debate and just understanding what we're arguing what we're not arguing uh it also shouldn't

be confused with characterization although characterization is the fact that although framing is the fact that characterization not all characterization is framing because for example you could analyze um the way that a certain group or a certain uh particular set of people operate and that could be uh with in no way like uh in doing either enhancing your arguments or limiting the arguments of the other side is just a core burden that you need to explain within uh the argument EG if

you are analyzing X group is likely to do X thing then you need to characterize what are the incentives and building blocks of this particular group of people that's not necessarily framing uh and it shouldn't be confused either of the two uh for more information you can check out my video on characterization where I uh basically go uh in a deep dive as to how to characterize and make your characteristic uh realistic cool uh so this is the basics of framing again

this is kind of a creative thing because it it kind of pops up and different people can think of different types of framing but this a general theoretical landscape obviously from this moment on I won't go through all of the types of framing but I'll go through the types of framing that I have either seen or I myself have uh run in many of these cases that you can try to understand and try to modulate within uh your debate

practice so the first type of framing is the this is used rarely versus this is used many types framing or the this is uh used with good or bad incentive framing like these two things are kind of different but in most cases they are coating between each other uh so basically this is mostly used in debates about uh tools instruments or like some kind of strategies that we're doing uh and I gave here A bunch of examples so

let's look at motion by motion and how we can use this type of framing for it so the first motion is this house believes that the protections of international law conventions and treaties should not apply to combatants from terrorist organizations EG uh prohibition of on torture prisoner of war status guarantees of postconflict release so BAS basically uh this motion is to release the normal international law conventions from let's say you know like the Western military forces or military

forces of the of countries in general uh so that they can actually deploy these tactics that we would otherwise consider uh immoral torture being uh one of them not just immoral illegal so that they can uh more effectively fight against uh terrorist organization so a very simple framing that we could do here is to just say that yes we are allowing them to utilize this tool which is torture and all the other uh multiple policies that

are within this but that doesn't mean that the generals or the soldiers will always use this or use it in a vast majority of situations rather they'll use it in only specific situations uh where uh where they where the benefits

to cost ratio is like high uh so basically they'll use this rarely there are many reasons why this is the case uh they themselves understand that if they torture too many people they'll radicalize the local population they'll

feel retaliation uh there is free media in the west that necessarily will document and talk about these type of things it's like to be a very Pol politicized Scandal uh in many of these cases um there's like also accountability measures internally because these countries are democracy so they are elected people who are putting checks and balance mechanisms on these people like checking out what they're doing and stuff like that all of these reasons mean that the actors who are the

soldiers and the generals have a lot of pressures even though they're allowed to use this to not use it all the time like I think the first time this is used ever or the first time I've saw this framing used ever was the 2017 hws round Roman final uh where you know like uh from closing opposition I think uh Dan laa and sah Neville I hope I got him right are debating you know like uh uh this

house with abandoned decapitation and they from Co stand up and say hold on uh the fact that uh we have for example f-16s doesn't mean that we're all the time using them to bomb people uh obviously we are using our tools and our military equipment with restraint here are reasons why uh this is the case and after this framing is done you drastically amplify the impacts that you are talking about because then you can say we're we're going to use this in the

most dire situation where for example if we can torture someone we get information we can stop a terrorist attack from happening or if we torture someone we gain critical information so that we can uh do an air strike at one of the bases killing one of their leaders uh you know you are expanding the amount of impacts that you talking about while at the same time mitigating the impacts on the other side because then you're saying if we don't torture

all that much if we don't torture all that many times then that means all of the arguments that presumably op were run in terms of uh people radicalizing in terms of uh this being a principal harm you know we're not torturing that many people in terms of whatever and whatever are lowered because they don't happen that often that many times uh so this is like something that seems neutral at first which is we won't use this too many times but then when you

put the bottom line in you are bending the debate uh in your favor and you in in in uh your in less so in your opponent's favor uh so this is one example uh the second example is this house would give industry Representatives EG uh unions or professional associations a veto over political appointments m in uh made in their area of expertise EG Bar Association When selecting judges teachers union when appointing an education Minister Etc so this motion is

not uh so much like uh literally the same as the first because it's not tool in terms of uh a literal tool lital instrument that we could use to do X thing rather it's a check mechanism that we're giving to a specific group of people um uh A specific group of people and how they're utilizing this uh this check mechanism so uh what is

the framing here again the framing is that you will use this veto power very very

rarely uh and you could give reasons as to why this is the case these industry representatives in many of these cases have to agree fundamentally on when they're vetoing someone there are many pressures for you not to agree to veto an appointment and things like that uh there are for example uh so yeah so basically this is a motion where all of these people have to agree on uh these type of things but there are many

pressures that make them not agree maybe some of them within this Union organization some of them are pro market others are anti-market uh you know it's like maybe some want um the market to be more profitable so that uh because they understand why it's important other people want uh other policies to uh to them and things like that uh and you know since a veto requires uh unanimity between these uh particular actors it's very very hard to actually aggregate

their preferences in one particular moment secondly and this is like pointing toward the motion this is not a motion about policy it's a motion to change the policy that the government is enacting this is a motion explicitly on the executive branch or what type what type of people are actually enacting uh these type of policies meaning that in many of these cases they uh they won't be able to come to an agreement to veto except

for the situations where objectively bad candidates are being appointed these are situations firstly corrupt candidates being appointed uh EG people who for example are closer to the political party uh who aren't like the most competent people and are objectively like political positions that are appointed there to serve the government and you know they and you as the uh industry representative you are scared that these people will be super super bad uh when it comes

to uh like them trying to steal money and things like that so corrupt or non-competent individuals again similarly uh similar mechanism here which is like they're appointed because they're close uh to the government but people who are objectively will be bad at planning bad at executing policy bad at following guidelines and all of these type of things again this is not a debate about policy it's a debate about the enacting of the set policy

um and you know you could give the reasons uh and it's like it to activate in these situations because these are the situations where all of the people will objectively that are within this Union will be objectively against the appointment of of this particular person because this is the moment where all of their incentives are diametrically opposed to this I EG uh people have only people the only thing that people can agree on is that they hate corruption is

that they hate ineffectiveness if that's if then that's the case and the debate activates only in this 1 to 2% of situations where people are pointing I would say there are more because there are some very scandalous piics but one to two% of situations then basically opposition can't really do anything about that because they're arguing uh uh with uh like objectively good decisions so From This Moment opposition either has to explain why they have incentives to uh actually uh veto in a majority of

situation EG respond to your incentives and provide alternative incentives or they operate within your framing thus their arguments aren't relative because your arguments are pointing to this particular subset of situations um and again this is with the this will be used rarely uh framing their good incentives Framing and things like that and the final example that I want to point out and this is a recorded round so like you can check it out in uh like it's the P

of Belgrade WDC uh this house believes that environmental movement should take should take more radical actions in the fight against climate change EG blocking roads vandalism blowing up pipes Etc so basically like environmental movements to do uh these things again the way that we framed it we were opening government was to just simply say look the fact that you're going to use this this tactic doesn't mean that you're going to use it uh like many times doesn't even

uh mean that you're going to use it in a lot of times uh and we gave reasons you know like environmental movements are not stupid uh they have checks and balances internally some people will be against uh utilizing this type of thing they're like either because they think it's a bad idea or because they're scared they understand that even like maybe some in some of these cases this will cause a lot of harm like if you

blow up a pipe maybe this also will harm the uh rest of the environment and things like that meaning that in the majority of uh situations they will use this only as a method of Last Resorts only if they can't uh push policy through other means like let's say protesting and things like that so that they can uh blow up the pipes after this happens the subset of situations that uh government is talking about are only the

good ones and the subset of situations that opposition talking talking about don't activate because the bad one there are no incentives to do this in a bad way so again you're providing framing that completely destroys the opposition bench and either op has to respond to your framing or concede it and somehow win within it which it's very very hard for them uh for them to do so uh by the way like I think the motion stats on

this motion I could be wrun are crazy because uh not many government teams passed on this motion whereas in reality after you do this framing it's fairly easy to uh pass through G like you've you've dealt with the most important contingency on opposition and unless they respond back to your framing uh they don't have a chance cool uh a version of this framing you know the this will be used really and things like that is that is the framing not many

people op in framing uh which is kind of the same but it's a bit different so this is not in terms of tools that we are utilizing or like options or policies or things like that rather it's about uh policies that now create a phenomenon that can be widely accepted by uh people and how in which groups of people will operate within this framing I think the best example that I could give here is there was this motion uh

like there was this movie about buying and selling of years I think it uh Justin Timberlake was in it or something like that so you guys can check it out uh and basically the they gave a motion on this which is assuming uh the technology exists this house would permit the buying and selling of years of your life uh so the way it works is

that you can go and you can literally sell uh off uh years of your life to a

certain person uh and for exchange for money and things like that so basically the way that you can this motion from Guff is just to say that just to list reasons as to why people won't sell their time and you know there are many reasons for this uh people care people have uh inevitable fear of death which is the strongest pressure that uh would allow them would not allow them to sell their years especially if they can

literally see their years sticking by and see how much they have of those particular years and how problematic that would be for them uh secondly like they they want to do aspirational things like spend time with their family uh like do like go and travel like achieve things uh for uh for themselves that if they see in this direct trade-off they wouldn't particularly uh they wouldn't particularly do maybe some people will be straight up untrustworthy with this

type of Technology as well maybe some people just wouldn't feel like it's a good idea to do this the same way somehow people are aren't accustomed to using certain Technologies today like some people are scared to use uh to shop online with their cars because they're afraid of being hacked uh and stuff like that meaning that for the vast majority of people there are very strong pressures for them not to opt in to sell these uh their years even if it is

allowed who are then the people who uh will do this uh and these are the people who are for example poor and don't have a lot of options these are people who for example uh are at the final stages of uh of their life and they would like to live let's say the final year uh very very in a very very cool way uh you know like uh with a lot of money and living it to the highest uh and this being

their choice and these are people that um objectively it's very hard on opposition to argue that this is a bad idea to do right because if poor people can for example sell off 20 years of their life and this uh these 20 years can be worth a lot of money um then this is objectively good idea for them to do the second implication of this framing is that if not many people sell their years but there is a lot of demand

because presumably rich which people in higher middle class would like to buy your to extend their life then that means that the price of each individual year is likely to be high meaning that the bargain that uh poor people are now getting uniquely based on this mechanism is likely to be big meaning that with this money they can do great things like for example pay off their house educate their children and do things like that so we drastically increase social

Mobility so this way we are expanding the total amount of uh uh the the power of our arguments and we're depleting the arguments on the opposite site uh so yeah so this is uh this is kind of like in the similar logic although not the same execution which is uh not many people will uh opt into this type of thing uh framing other other examples of this is like this is literally all drugs motion the fact that you legalize drugs

doesn't mean that tomorrow everyone will use uh these however the benefits of having legalized drugs will apply to the people that already use it etc etc uh there was this very interesting motion about like this concept of self- partnership which basically Bally there are these people who uh deci decide to like not uh how do you say not uh not find love um I'm not sure in reality of like uh uh how widespread this is and

things like that it was kind of like a an interesting motion to debate and we were closing opposition and honestly the the one thing that we ran uh as framing was most people have an incentive to opt into love because GV was like oh but it's so important to have love blah blah blah uh and things like that and we were like okay if it's so important for the the people that you are talking about then these people opting to love

anyway there are some people who for example love can't be accessible to them we gave like illustrations and reasons as to what these groups of people are so this concept of self- partnership really really helps these people and honestly Government after uh This was done couldn't really do much about it so and they ended up losing so yeah that's more or less how this this is about this group versus this about this group framing uh Works cool uhing out frame my favorite

uh type of framing uh so what is a Tipping Point art frame uh this is you this can be used for very high burden SL crazy arguments uh but also not just High burden arguments it can be used to any type of argument that has a significant burden um so basically the typing Point outf Frame Works you could prove either that something might happen or not happen due to many Factor and that the motion is in no way shape

or form a Tipping Point within uh the probability of a set thing happening so the classic example is this is only social movement motion uh social movement dox thing opening government stands up and sayfe we will change policy now uh we will for example uh legalize abortion and things like that or we will do X thing these huge humongous impacts uh that will happen and you from CG can just stand up and say uh look we agree all of this were to

to happen it would be very cool however there are many barriers to this to policy change that opening government doesn't address policies require a majority political parties have competing incentives I.E they may care about the interest of this particular social movement but they also care about the interest of other groups of people uh as well you could probably give more that means that there are a lot of barriers that just the analysis that they provide do not reach the Tipping

Point to change the scales of the decision from one to another we agree maybe in some cases it happens but it won't happen in a vast majority of cases then all you have to do is just prove a lower burden more plausible argument that is more like and just weigh uncertainty and say our arguments apply to a vast majority of situations and uh things like that I get the question sometimes is this a step uh in my

opinion this is not a step because it's not directly contradicting the analysis I explaining why the analysis is not uh right is not true it is explaining why the analysis is not enough which is obviously a strategy with do in debating if this is not applicable then analysis extension wouldn't work as well right because if you stand up and

say or didn't explain this burden here is how the analysis fits into this burden or you know just stating the obvious that

arguments have burdens and our burdens need to be explained is also like and like they need to be weighed against this is also how judging in general Works uh so yeah so Tipping Point out Frame Works very very well particularly against highb burden crazy ideas uh and things like that um it could be so like it's funny because it should work in the reverse way in my opinion I.E like opening teams should take the low burden

arguments and closing teams should take the higher burden arguments because they have more time to analyze and more time to explain but funnily enough this happens a lot of times like this it happens more times that opening teams are taking higher burden arguments and from closing you have the lower burden argument all you have to do is simply out frame and run that and uh you're good to go cool uh frame in strengths of actors in

relation to each other uh what does this mean this means when you are uh arguing about something and you uh and if you analyze why one actor is much more stronger than another actor then again you amplify the power of your arguments and you dis amplify the power of opposition's arguments so the first example is this house would prohibit companies from regulating private behaviors of their employees in employment contracts sorry EG mandatory drug tests no smoking policy regulating

their behavior employees behavior on social media prohibiting models actors from dating and stuff like that so if you just explain that the power that companies have uh you know because you know they have money they have lawyers uh they have uh industry experience and things like that is much more stronger than a single individual employee uh who is likely to know have self-doubt who is likely you know to uh agree to this stuff even though it's a

bad idea to them uh and stuff stuff like that then this drastically expands the amount of arguments that you have because then companies uh can mandate many things from you and many things that are uh illegitimate from you so like it's not just uh smoking you know that they stop it's also regulating other behaviors that you are that you are having many of them so that way you are drastically empowering your uh your prob uh your power of arguments in this

moment and you also explain the necessity of the policy why the policy demands uh State straight uh action and straight regulation because if individuals are unable to bargain for themselves if this is literally a choice that they have to do between uh their personal uh values and having a job that it's an illegitimate Choice then the government should step in and like uh stop it and they shouldn't allow it to happen uh so yeah so this is uh

basically how with the characterization explanation of the two actors and how one actor is much more relatively stronger than the other actor you're expanding your impacts and you're explaining the necessity of the policy uh second example is for the purposes of this debate the Israeli military has the ability to air strike Iranian nuclear sites and they lay Iran's nuclear program by 3 years this house is Israel would air strike Iranian nuclear sites so this motion uh is very very

interesting because it's kind of like an act of War if you think about it like literally doing this um so you need to actually be ready that an opposition in this this debate can claim retaliatory action and it's highly highly likely that this will happen like there is no way that you will do this and retaliatory action against you won't happen it's just as simple as that um so the number one argument that an OP team

will run in this debate would be backlash or War um from the Iranian site and it's very very likely that this will be true like it's very hard to argue that this is not something that's likely to happen so a framing that we thought up from closing govern was just simply to explain that currently Iran is in a very very problematic State uh internally like they're they're poor they're facing internal uh problems like protests and things like that so they don't

necessarily have the greatest capacity to respond back whereas Israel has you know like a lot of funding from the West they have the Iron Dome technology to defend themselves and uh do things like that so this framing had two implications the first is that the backlash is unlikely to harm Israel to that much an extent we agree that most likely some people will be hurt we just don't think it's that that much of a likelihood and the second thing that we

did was just to explain if that's then the case then if Iran is currently in a very bad situation they don't have that much power they have all of these problems associated with them then the additional damage that destroying their air strike would do would cause enough problems for them in enough uh let's say holes in their uh system and things like that uh that this will lead to to uh Israel firstly stopping their capacity to do all of these problematic things

but secondly to be able to do is uh other things like for example cause chaos internally within the country set up spy networks and things like that so then on the trade-off it's a much better idea for you to do this action rather than to not do it uh again this is just analyzing the strength and power of two different actors and why one actor is much stronger than another that derail the power of the opposition claimed on

backlash and expands the power of the benefit that you are going to achieve while doing this uh action and finally uh like I couldn't really find the motion but basically all of the China versus US trade debates uh I think there was one motion about internalization of the Yuan and China continuing to do it which was given in 2022 I think uh or 2021 was it it was 2021 it was not the dogs Bridges uh and

basically uh when we ran this when we we were closing government and the framing that we ran was uh the United States is in a super weak position right now postco and post uh inflation like post all of the printing of money uh the like injection of capital within the economy and things like that meant that the dollar really really lost its value which meant that many countries are now wondering why are we holding all of

these dos if they're if they're losing this Val value shouldn't this be the reserve currency of the world uh which means that now there is a incentive to turn to China uh as a as an alternative in this particular moment so just analyzing the two strengths again proves the necessity of the policy or why the policy would be a good idea at

the time uh I think this is the final type of framing although I could be wrong

which is the oh no I I like there two more framings there's one more framing with this one so the other type of framing is there is still incentive to do X think uh and this is like probably one of the easiest types of framing honestly hold on I just need to take a drink so basically if you try to uh prove from a side that X thing will happen naturally or there other pressures to do

X thing then you are deeply mitigating the other side's impacts so for example there was this motion about this house would perate cities from offering subsidies to Amazon for moving their businesses there something like that I don't really recall the motion I couldn't find it but in general the way the motion works is is currently cities are offering tax breaks on Amazon or direct money subsidies so that they move to their city city and they set up like

a warehouse or something like that to incentivize job creation uh if you just point out that Amazon has all of the incentives on this planet to move to other cities anyway uh and you just list those incentives uh they want to expand their market share they want to beat back their competition uh in the way Supply chains works is that you have to have uh warehouses in many places so you most likely go to as many uh like um

cities as possible in order to have interconnectivity of your supply chain and stuff like that meaning that there is enough pressure already for Amazon going to these types of uh cities meaning that the policy about providing them tax breaks and things like that isn't necessary I.E Amazon is just taking this money this tax break or direct subsidy and they're just fueling to the profitability that they currently have uh and then you can just run all of

the arguments about how it's bad to give uh them money not not from a socialist perspective but I mean from literally you're depleting this local municipalities budget they can't invest in their own infrastructure they can't invest in their own businesses in their Healthcare in their education and stuff like that which means that again we are expanding the power of our arguments and we're lowering the power of Ops arguments because we explained that Ops arguments will happen anyway but the

harms directly associated with this policy uh happen uniquely on uh our uh on our s uh and we uniquely stop them with this particular uh policy all intervention motions are like this if like if you get a motion about we should intervene on X thing and if you stand up and prove well X thing will resolve itself anyway there are many reasons why this is the case uh but intervention is bad you win um a a very interesting

motion here is like this house prefers the quality of art being viewed as predominantly subjective as opposed to predominantly objective uh this is a pretty interesting debate because uh we were kind of weirded out by it I think it was Madrid round two I think we were opening opposition and honestly the way we broke this debate was to say but people have already a natural inclination to view art objectively uh art is physical in many of these cases

like it's a painting it has physical parameters to it it's a book you have written it down uh so there are already objective criteria to look at this what doesn't exist is a subjective criteria uh which means that you have a much more balanced Viewpoint or at least both viewpoints on our side of the house and I go you have one uh which after that we just said we think there is no way to adjudicate which one is better but we I

think having both of these options is just a good thing uh this was a pretty weak case not going to lie like it was uh uh it was kind of like uh not particularly good but it is like so weak and so obvious that no one could respond to it in that in the debate like you couldn't really think of an adequate response to it and we we won uh uh we got low speaks uh on this debate because

like it was kind of boring but uh to be honest it's kind of interesting how you you break the debate afterwards uh and no one can't really respond to that particular thing so this is the there are still incentives to do X thing uh pring narratives narratives baby uh I thought I was wondering like if I should do this but after talking with Nikki and uh apparently he shared with uh he shared with me that people really don't

get this uh Framing and that he just went into a debate and did it and people uh like really didn't know how to respond to it I guess like to me this is very very Basics and I thought people knew it already but like let's do it uh so yeah so basically uh when people debate narratives they debate narratives as if one the features that they like are the inherent features and conclusions of the thing that they want so like if we're

debating this house uh regrets The Narrative that people should find a soulmate or something like that uh and we just cherry pick the worst possible versions of this particular thing so for example you know because uh this narrative exists I don't know like uh girls are heartbroken uh and like uh they go through trauma uh because like they they end up uh uh wasting their time with a bunch of boys and uh this like deeply harms them and things

like that um and you know without ever connecting it with how the narrative is or why the narrative uh increases or decreases this particular thing and the second thing is they're debating it as if the narrative is the only soulle motivator for an action uh which is like weird narratives are not brainwashing uh things that make you operate within one or another framing there are people who uh like believe in a narrative there are people

who don't believe in a narrative for example uh there is a narrative that you should probably marry early and start a family but there are many people who aren't marrying already starting a family uh there's a narrative that people should donate to charity I don't donate to charity all that much for example uh there's a narrative that I don't know about exting and there are many people that don't do it or do it kind of for people who do it uh and

things like that like why is this the case basically two things here the first is that there are other narratives in society to do you to do X to tell that tell you to do xtin or there are other incentives that push you to do X think that's the that's the reason like people aren't monists they have they're multi plastered even like the most simplest PS of people have multiple sets uh uh like of uh characteristics to them and

literally the first lecture on behavioral economics is different people do different things based on uh different circumstances or different motivating factors so knowing this allows you to open up to different possibilities of things to run in a narratives debate so how does this look practically uh so there was this motion I couldn't find it on the tab again this house perers a narrative that not working class middle class they should have said sorry middle class people uh

should focus on Leisure as opposed to work um and like if you just frame in this debate there are many reasons for for uh people to focus on Leisure people are lazy people are short- termis people what like to self- gratify themselves and things like that which means that uh firstly if there's a narrative that tells them to focus on Leisure then this is more tilted towards Leisure that means that one people don't really get much of leisure because you know in

order to get as most of leisure as possible you need to actually be work hard enough so that the two things balance out because without pain there is no pleasure and secondly people just spend too much time on Leisure they won't focus on productive things that we need in society like uh how do you say uh like things to be built services to be brought and stuff like that meaning that if there is a narrative that uh

like tells you to focus on worth then the two things are counterbalanced you still have Leisure because it's still a priority for you but you are more tilted to Works work in a balanced way to care the it's a priority and stuff like that you can do absolutely the same thing in Reverse you could say there are many reasons as to why you care about work there are many internal pressures uh there may narratives and things like

that that make you do this uh thus this narrative is a counterbalance and it tells you to focus on Leisure and things like that importantly you are characterizing the narrative through an objective lens this way you are actually analyzing why the narrative uh operates the way it does or why people's incentive will change uh the way uh the way they change which means that you are more likely to have a tailored or adequate version of uh what the

narrative is via framing uh in this particular moment finally what are the dangers of Framing and I I I I think that if you were able to watch all of this this is something that I should stress uh that becomes a problem down the line maybe it won't be a problem for you today for sure it won't be a problem for you when you start doing

[Music] [Music]

[Music] [Music]

change the currency you physically have to gather the money you physically have to exchange the money it's also little things like for example going to the vending machines and changing the coins and the letters and things like that so like uh even if you are doing this in the best possible way you have inherent problems of doing this particular action uh which meant that we destroyed the framing afterwards and this was a moment

where uh even if uh you spend

like four minutes framing this way uh and you have very little case afterwards if we destroy your framing in one or two minutes because we have the side of logic on our side uh and we built more arguments than not that like debating is a time thing but statistically you're able to utilize your time very very better at this particular case also sometimes you can't just frame sometimes you think that you can uh overframe too many things uh and you are just you end

up wasting your time instead of focusing your time on actually building the arguments and uh uh things like that because never forget ultimately the arguments are the things that win you the debate if a team on OG frames out everything uh within the debate uh closing government will beat them because closing government have the arguments so it must be a balanced combination of the two and you shouldn't be too dependent like like all things

you shouldn't be too dependent on rebuttal you shouldn't be too dependent on weighing you should have a myriad of tools that you should use in a balanced way and you should try to know which tools to use when uh secondly even though I kind of talked about this but not all debates can be framed and broken not all the baits you can use selective and strategic framing not all the baits you can use uh this will only be about

this particular group of people uh framing you have to be wary of these things uh obviously this is like there is no formula here you in general get better as you go about it through trial and error uh but you should know that not everywhere you can use this Framing and you should have a more balanced and adequate approach and finally you should be worried that maybe the judge can't get your Framing and that's perfectly fine not all judges you know are uh

obligated to understand everything that you're running maybe you run it in a bad way uh maybe they're just from a circuit that doesn't use framing uh which means that uh in this situation you should either like get better so like try to explain your framing in a better way or not do it in all and just run arguments and things like that uh yeah so these are the dangers of framing that you need to be aware of my biggest

advice to you is experiment try running framing as much as you can um but if you're a person who for example has done it for some time uh you should probably default back to not running framing uh that much and try to do uh argument building and things like that like honestly this was the main thing that I learned I learned only one thing between Belgrade worlds and Madrid worlds and that thing was I was over

dependent on this thing uh and I needed to diversify my skill set to other uh parameters of improvement and like had someone told me this uh earlier maybe I could have uh been more successful earlier as well but hey you are learning while you're live as we say in Bulgarian cool so I hope this was helpful uh if you have like framing ideas and things like that so like uh you've tried framing please share in the

comments and also ask questions because it helps other people a lot like And subscribe and see you in the next video