Foreword:

This document is intended to teach you some of the necessary skills for participating in an MUN conference as a delegate, as well as giving you additional practice exercises for your own free time.
As a delegate, only you know how much training you may need ahead of time and only you can muster up the discipline to put in the needed effort. These exercises are designed for self-study, entirely independent of others, so your own initiative is needed, as they are in debate. Nevertheless, you may do them with a teacher and check them with one of your chairs or trainers.
This is intended to train delegates who already understand the basic rules of MUN and its ways of debating! If any terms in this document are unfamiliar to you, consult your teacher, trainer or the delegate guide!
This Document is best viewed on a computer due to its interactive structure.

Structure:

1. **Doing Policy research**
   1.1 Preparing for a country - check list
   1. 2 Practicing adapting to international policy

2. **Writing**
   2. 1 Writing Speeches
   2. 2 Writing POIs
   2. 3 Writing Amendments

   2. 4 Writing preambulatory clauses
   2. 5 Writing operative clauses

3. **Practical debate skills**
   3. 1 How to spot and recognize fallacies

---

1. Doing Policy research

What is Policy?

Policy as per the conventions of MUN are statements of intent which a country makes about an issue, meaning **measures they wish to take or have taken in a specific topic**. For example, a country may offer money to anyone wishing to buy an electric car to make that option more appealing to consumers.

Policy is one of three dimensions of Politics overall and concerns itself with the contents of Politics. For more on this, read this article.

How do I research my countries, Policy?

Your country has a general policy on the issue your committee discusses. Depending on the size of your country, your government may have issued a statement on the issue or there may be historical precedent.

When using any kind of source for your research, keep in mind that they must be checked for credibility.

Sources that contradict each other, information that is old and possibly outdated and more can hurt your understanding of an issue. You have likely discussed how to check sources in class, but these two articles should help:

In depth Wiki-how on how to find credible sources (German): here

Smaller overview on credibility of sources (German): here

Researching a topic as large as nuclear weapons for countries like France or Gabon can be daunting, so see below for a list of factors to consider. Further, researching is a skill that must be honed to truly perfect it. A general help on how to do research for professional college-level topics can be found here.

Often, when researching topics that concern international politics, you will find that many have an interest in swaying your opinion one way or another. This kind of underlying opinion is called bias and can be harmful to the truth. An informative video on historical (and political) bias in your sources can be found here.

Here are factors to consider when researching a country:

- Is my country **a colonizer or an ex-colonized country?** If so, who colonized it? Does my former colonizer still have a hand in my country's economy or politics?
- **Where is my country located?** How do neighboring countries influence its Policy? (example: Belarus being influenced by Russia)
- **What alliances or groups is my country part of?** Is it in the EU or the NATO, or perhaps part of a bond with other smaller countries? What are those allies' stances on the issue? (example: Yemen and Egypt are both part of Arab League and share interests in that regard)

- **Could the issue affect trade routes for my country?** What are my country's main sources of income and what are the countries' plans for the future? (example: Saudi Arabia's main export is oil, but they are looking to expand into Tourism in the future)
- **What is the** religious, economic and **general demographic make-up of my country? What form of government is currently in place and how stable is it?** (example: Afghanistan is currently experiencing extreme internal instabilities)
- **What historical events have shaped my country?** Who have I been at war with in recent times, what war have I supported? (example: France and Germany have overcome their century-long rivalry since the 60ies and enjoy a close political friendship now)

Here are reliable sources of information to research with:

- Wikipedia. Despite what your teachers may have told you, Wikipedia is a fairly neutral and scientifically meticulous source to get started on that is harder to falsify than many others. Still, keep in mind that it is written and sourced from what may be biased people.
- Last Week Tonight by John Oliver. This is an American TV show that covers singular issues in segments between 15 and 45 minutes with great detail and sources. If your specific issue is part of their videos, it can be a great source. Keep in mind that they offer an exclusively American view on many issues
- The official UN Website. This source is so obvious you may just overlook it. They are especially informative on previously passed real-life resolutions which may give you an insight on realistic solutions for real-life problems
- The official EU Website. Similar to that of the UN, the EU has an official website dedicated to laying out their policies across the globe
- Various official government websites for your specific country - keep in mind that these may be automatically translated and contain mistakes. Check the ending of the url to see where the website is hosted (.de is a german website, .uk is british, and so on)
- BestDelegate. This is a more general website that holds information for general MUN research and related topics
- ScienceDirect. This is a medical journal which may be able to help with various health and science related topics
- The official website of the german ministry for political education (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung). This website holds many german-language articles on various historical issues, though viewed through a german perspective
- The offcial RSF (reporters without borders) website. This organization is dedicated to ending censorship and suppressed freedom of speech and are officially supported by many nations. They have also founded an initiative for an uncensored library in minecraft
- **LAST BUT MOST IMPORTANTLY:** Your committee's research report, written and checked by your chairs, usually found on the AMUN Website under your specific committee. This is a roundabout perfectly curated report on your committee's topics and invaluable as a quick start into your issue.

1.1 Preparing for a country - checklist

After your time preparing for your country has elapsed and the conference is imminent to start, you should make sure that you have done your research thoroughly enough and gone about it effectively. For this, you can use the checklist below as a general overview on what you should know before going into the process of writing clauses or debating. If you can answer all the below statements with yes, you are well prepared for what is ahead:

- I know the main exports and imports of my country and to whom they go or from whom they come
- I know the main industries of my country and how well they have been doing in recent times
- I can evaluate the impact which the following events had on my country: Colonialism, the World wars, the Cold War, the Pandemic
- I know my relationships to my neighboring countries and know at least 2-3 countries in my committee which share similar interests to me
- I know how my country stands politically to the following countries: Russia, the USA, Germany, France, the UK, China
- I know the form of government I will be representing and can act accordingly
- I understand the issue we are debating and which countries are most affected by it
- I have researched some previous solutions from my country or how the issue has affected me and found their current level of progress
- When asked rough statistical questions about the country, such as size, location and GDP, I can answer with relative ease
- I have all my research in writing in a way that is easy for me to overview and I have a few sources on hand in case I need to read up again later on

<u>Simplified Example:</u>
The country you have been assigned is Estonia. The topic is helping indigenous communities deal with the aftermath of natural catastrophes. For this, you should research if Estonia has a significant indigenous group which is disproportionately affected by systemic issues such as natural disasters - they do not. As a settled European country, their native population is integrated into society at large and the country is not strongly affected by natural disasters as some other countries like Peru or the USA. Similarly, though prevention methods cost money, this issue has very limited applications to the economy, meaning there is no angle from this side either - it is a humanitarian issue. Still, as a member of the international community, NATO and the EU, Estonia has an interest in helping indigenous communities. Estonia is part of 3 Baltic States and has in recent times tried to redefine itself as a nordic country, aligning itself with other north european nations. Estonia's connections to Russia have been historically strained, so they may oppose Russia in policy for this reason while supporting Ukraine. Further, as a rather small economy, it is in their interest to keep their own spending low.
Generally, should there be no contradictory opinion to be found at all, Member states of the UN will argue for human rights and its preservations. This means on the above topic, Estonia would support clauses and policies made to genuinely help, stand alongside fellow EU members and oppose Russia, unless Russia makes terms they can 100% support.

1. 2 Practicing adapting to international policy

Now, practice researching for various countries and topics with the following exercise:

First, use this website to generate a number between 1 and 30. Set the lower limit to 1 and the upper limit to 30. Generate two numbers in the given range. Find your country based on your first number (A) and your topic based on your second (B) below and set a timer for a time between 15 and 45 minutes, depending on how challenging you want to make the experience for yourself. Then, begin research and take notes as you go. Attempt to find out as much as you can in the time you have with the methods outlined in 1. And 1.1.

Table A:

1. Afghanistan
2. Argentina
3. United States of America
4. United Kingdom
5. Russian Federation
6. France
7. China
8. Japan
9. Gabon
10. Palestine
11. Israel
12. Bangladesh
13. Bosnia and Herzegovina
14. Chile
15. Canada
16. Cambodia
17. Ukraine
18. Islamic republic of Iran
19. Malta
20. Libya
21. Nicaragua
22. Norway
23. Mexico
24. Poland
25. Philippines
26. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
27. Viet Nam
28. Zimbabwe
29. Saudi Arabia
30. Serbia

Table B:

1. Removing tangible barriers for children worldwide to escape poverty
2. Hindering “Brain drain” from developing countries
3. Establishing or re-establishing food security in regions of crisis
4. Defending religious freedom of persecuted minorities
5. Rethinking protocols for the prevention of pandemics and epidemics
6. Improving education across the world through new technology
7. Managing the use of drones and automated weapon systems in armed conflicts
8. Fighting the struggle for secure water sources in the wake of water insecurity worldwide
9. Maximizing the implementation of Wind and Sun energy
10. Exploring options for waste reduction and prevention
11. Regulating nuclear energy production, its dangers and waste products
12. Rethinking nuclear arms deals and the use of chemical weaponry
13. Returning stolen colonial artifacts and building bridges between communities
14. Improving standard of living for rural and isolated communities
15. Reducing factory farming and financing new paths against food insecurity
16. Protecting coral reefs and fragile ecosystems
17. Exploring the impact of private military contractors on global contracts
18. Providing aid for the situation in Ukraine
19. Finding solutions for the Israel-Palestine conflict
20. Examining the Relationship between Legalization of Marijuana and Drug Related Crime
21. Addressing issues of child slavery across the world and working to outlaw it
22. Managing the growing threat of cyber war and the weaponization of global networks
23. Ensuring equal distribution of medication and vaccination to communities in need
24. Reducing systemic racism, sexism and bias in governmental structures
25. Strengthening democratic systems and elections against interference
26. Addressing the issue of reproductive rights and gender related health concerns
27. Preventing the increase of IDP (Internally displaced persons) in the world
28. Examining weaknesses in international trade routes and finding methods against them
29. Closing the gender gap in social protection, pay, housing and safety
30. Addressing censorship and propaganda across the globe in the age of the internet

Using both tables and the above outlined method, you can find over 900 unique contry/topic combinations for which you can try writing clauses and researching policy. Challenge yourself by expanding your general knowledge of global situations and finding effective methods to research! Do not switch topics if one may feel too challenging, rather give yourself a bit more time and attempt to find something even if it feels difficult.
Practice on various levels of depth and timeframes.

2. Writing

Writing for an MUN conference is met with a difficulty that most academic writers do not have to face: Time crunch. Most speeches or POIs should not be or cannot be pre-written and must

therefore be prepared in as little as a few seconds during the debate. People react differently to this sense of pressure and impromptu speaking is something which needs to be trained.

In general, there are two aspects which need to be trained when looking at MUN participation: Writing and its practical application, which we will look at later.

2. 1 Writing Speeches

Speeches in MUN are held to defend a position or a resolution. In general, they should not extend a minute of speaking time, which means no more than 120-150 words of writing.
In general, a speech presents one or several arguments, though its better to limit yourself to one for a regular speech.

An argument has a set structure that, most simply, follows three steps:

First, you make the statement which you are aiming to argue, what you claim to be true. This can be introduced with a rhetorical question or some other device to make it more appealing for the listened. Such as:

Dear Delegates, honourable chairs: For how long will the international community watch as people around the world go without clean water? Water is a human right, one which we finally need to make accessible for everyone.

Second, a fact or specific situation should be introduced to narrow down your topic or make your position clear. Since a speech in debate most often argues for or against something, at latest now you should "prove" a connection between your claim and what you would like the committee to do:

In order to end our own inaction, we must pass new clauses on this issue immediately. We strongly urge every delegation to vote in favour of the Resolution presented here on the floor and support the clauses we have outlined within.

Thirdly and often lastly, reason should be given as to why this course of action should be followed. Ideally, you can cite a source or statistic to support your claim, but sometimes a persuasive argument is much simpler:

We have worked hard and for a long time to come to compromises and as we get ready to submit a final vote, we would like to remind all delegates that, should we not pass this Resolution,
we once again do nothing for those who suffer from lack of clean water. We thus urge all member states to vote in favour of this excellent resolution. Thank you, we yield back to the chair.

The above speech, broken down in its elements, is exactly 150 words, so 1 minute of speaking time if one speaks slowly enough.

Still, you may have more time than anticipated - after all, the human brain is much faster at processing language than at reading it. You may include more than one argument in your speech, or you may already prepare for a retort:

This adds a fourth element to your argument, a counterpoint, and a fifth, its retort. A counterpoint states the argument someone opposing you may make, framed in a way that is easy for you to refute:

Though it has been framed as too expensive or laborious to build sufficient infrastructure for clean water everywhere, that simply isn't true.

And the retort:

In fact, in India alone, the economic burden caused by lack of clean water is immense: It costs India 600 million US Dollars per year to treat and deal with water-born diseases, a huge factor to their health sector.

In summary, your speech should be between 130 and 200 words long, lasting a minute if spoken and is composed of:

Intro (Dear Delegates, etc)
Statement (Water is a human right)
Demand (We must pass this resolution)
Proof (Because….)
OPTIONAL: Counterpoint (Its too expensive…?)
OPTIONAL: Retort (It is actually cheaper)
End phrase (thank you/we yield back)

The full speech looks like this:
Dear Delegates, honourable chairs: For how long will the international community watch as people around the world go without clean water? Water is a human right, one which we finally need to make accessible for everyone. In order to end our own inaction, we must pass new clauses on this issue immediately. We strongly urge every delegation to vote in favour of the Resolution presented here on the floor and support the clauses we have outlined within.
We have worked hard and for a long time to come to compromises and as we get ready to submit a final vote, we would like to remind all delegates that, should we not pass this Resolution,
we once again do nothing for those who suffer from lack of clean water. We thus urge all member states to vote in favour of this excellent resolution.
(Though it has been framed as too expensive or laborious to build sufficient infrastructure for clean water everywhere, that simply isn't true. In fact, in India alone, the economic burden caused by lack of clean water is immense: It costs India 600 million US Dollars per year to treat and deal with water-born diseases, a huge factor to their health sector.)

Thank you, we yield back to the chair.

During the debate, you will not have the time to write such a complete speech to read out, so you should internalise the structure and break down your speech into core points to more easily improvise off the top of your head. Things you should always write down include dates you wish to bring up, names (in their phonetic spelling), facts or data points and difficult phrasings.

Breaking down the above speech into simpler points may look like this:

- How long no water?
- Water human right
- Urge to vote pro
- If we dont pass, nothing changes
- Vote favour
- Framed as too expensive, untrue
- India cost water born disease: 600 mil $ per year

Exercises:

1. Breaking down speeches

Learning to phrase your speeches like this, taking notes and retelling them based on notes like this needs to be practiced.
To do so, watch the following speeches and attempt to take short notes on the key arguments/phrases/facts used. Then, hold them to yourself based on your notes. Stop the time. How close to the original length of the speech can you get?
Example speeches for this exercise can be found here, here and here
Further, good examples can be found on youtube if you simply google for speeches in english or german, such as of the German Bundestag or UK parliament. Another good source of short speeches can be "college graduation" speeches or addresses held by famous people, such as former President Barack Obama.

2. Identifying key phrases

As you study these and similar speeches, find phrases which you like and which are persuasive. Make a list of ten phrases that you wish to use in your own speeches.
Such as:

1. *It is evident that…*
2. *It can hardly be surprising that…*
3. *Considering all these factors, we find…*

3. Writing your own speeches

Take a research position from 1.2 or alternatively find a topic which interests you. Then, set a timer of five minutes and attempt to write a speech in that time, either in bullet points or a full text.

If you have time left over, set a three minute timer, eventually try two minutes for a 1 minute speech.
Try to pick new topics for each of them and work off the top of your head with as little additional research once the timer has started as you can.

When you are done, regardless of if you are done, hold the speech to yourself. Optionally, record yourself and listen to it.
Try to find things you liked and didn't like about your own speech - Speed, Intonation, Content, Persuasion - and take note of your weaknesses. Then, repeat the process.

You may also hold your speech to a member of your household, your cat or your parents. Once you have a speech you are truly confident in, reach out to a fellow delegate from your school or your trainer and ask them to review your speech.

Note:
Remember that MUN speeches should not use any personal pronouns (You, I, he, him) - You should only address other delegates as "the delegation of", should only speak of yourself as "we" or "the delegation of (your country)" and at most use "they" and "them" to refer to other members of the committee.

Good luck!

Note:
During a debate, you may write down a full speech during a break or after a day of debate, but you also may not have the time. Find out how much preparation you need with little wasted time and little stuttering over words. Note down your ideas in paper or digitally and consider your strategy.

<u>After a speech:</u>
Also, anticipate that you will be asked to open yourself up to Points of Information after your speech is done. Consider whether that is something you want.
Not opening yourself to POIs may be considered cowardly or make your argument look weaker, but the more controversial your speech is, the more people may be inclined to ask you questions. As a rule of thumb, I recommend opening yourself up to at least one or two points of information.
Anticipate these points by considering what you didn't answer in your point. Answering points of information in a good manner is a key mark of a good delegate.

2. 2 Writing POIs

Points of Information are questions posed to a delegate after they held a speech, presented an amendment or generally had the floor. They are called on by the Chairs and can be asked by any delegate. They are then answered by the delegate who was asked. The motion to respond to that response is called "Right of Reply".

This means that POIs go like this:

Delegate A holds a speech
The Chairs ask if A opens themselves to any points of information
Delegate A opens themselves up to… "any and all" (amount of POIs is determined by chair)
"Yes, one." (Only one POI may be asked)
"None." (POIs are skipped)

Then, the Chair asks the other delegates if any of them wish to ask any POIs. Any that do may raise their placards or hands. The chair then calls on a certain number.

Assuming Delegate A opened themselves up to any and all POI, as many as there are time for and the Chairs deem appropriate are called on.
Usually, if there are many delegates wishing to speak, the chair will call a certain amount of delegates ("Delegate of Ukraine, USA and Belgium") in a row. This means that they go in a row, after whoever was called before them.
If this happens to you, pay close attention to your turn and do not speak too early or miss your spot.
The scenario then continues like this:

Delegate of Ukraine rises and states their question
Delegate A responds
Delegate of Ukraine sits

Delegate of USA rises, by themselves, asks their POI
Delegate A responds
Delegate of USA sits

(repeat for delegate of Belgium)

After all POIs have been asked, the chairs will ask Delegate A to yield the floor back to the chair. The appropriate answer to this is: "So yielded."

Note: Despite how the rhythm of a speech, a POI and a response may feel or flow like a conversation, keep in mind that it is still part of debate procedure and goes through the chairs. That means you cannot directly address the delegate you are speaking to and must wait for the chairs to give all relevant instructions.

Writing POI:
Due to the POIs always being context-dependent and asked in the middle of the debate, writing them is more of a mental exercise and phrasing them should be automatic.
All POIs are questions, no exception. This means that your POI, once asked, should either be a one sentence question or phrased so that it ends on a question.

For example, a POI may simply be a question:
“Does the delegation believe that subclause a is enough to address the lack of hospitals in regions in crisis?”

Or a statement, followed by a question:
“In studies conducted by the WHO in 2021, it has been established that over 45% of people worldwide believe some sort of misinformation about COVID-19 or are poorly informed otherwise. Does the delegation believe the clause will combat this effectively?”

Keep in mind that the other person hears your point for the first time and also that the chairs and other delegates are listening! If they don’t understand, the delegate you are asking may ask the chair if you could repeat or rephrase your point. The chair will then ask you to do so and you will have to come up with an easier or simpler phrasing.

There are several reasons to be asking POIs and they are one of the absolute staples of a debate. Depending on your reason to ask them, keep in mind to phrase them respectively:

1. **To clarify a point**
   This occurs when a delegate makes a point or says something that you genuinely did not understand or have further questions on, the official purpose of a POI. Note that if the issue of your understanding is that they spoke too quietly, stumbled over their words or it was an issue of phrasing, you should not be asking a POI to them, but a Point of Privilege (“Point of Privilege, could the Chair please ask the Delegation to repeat XY, we were unable to understand them”)
   This kind of POI should simply be a question about the subject. Make sure they’re as specific as possible while still being broad enough to be useful to others. When you get your answer, factor this into your future stance. Especially in the beginning of debate of a resolution or amendment, do not hesitate to ask questions. Its never guaranteed that a question will resolve itself and most likely, other delegates are wondering the same thing.
2. **To raise a concern**
   This occurs when you have a concern with the way an argument is being held and you’d like to make a public statement about it, regardless of whether or not you agree or disagree with the argument. Make sure the concern isnt formal, meaning an issue with the flow of rules of debate - those should always be Points of Oder or Points of Information to the Chair. These POIs should be phrased as statements followed by a question, usually: “Is the delegate aware of this?”. Having studies or evidence ready which you can prepare by googling as the speech is held can be very helpful.
3. **To criticize an argument**
   Keep in mind that POis are one of the closest things to direct debate that can occur in MUN, since you directly ask about something that was said and get a reply. This means that POIs can be used to criticize an argument made in the previous speech - This is common, perhaps the second most common use of POIs in practical debate. The two

big things to make sure of are that a) they still most definitely need to be phrased as a question and b) the point of criticism is not based on a misunderstanding. This requires a bit of experience, but engaging in the debate critically is extremely important. Also, keep in mind that you will not be the last to speak on the topic, as your opponent has the last right to reply.

4. **To pivot the debate**
   Sometimes, a speech is held or an amendment debated in a way that doesn't actually work with what you believe is relevant to the debate. Up until a certain point, POIs can be about anything, even previously debated topics and topics only loosely connected to the speech you are raising a point about can be brought up. Asking the right POI can bring a forgotten aspect of the debate, without you having to go through the hassle of trying to get a speech in.
5. **To support an argument**
   Last but not least, POIs can also be used to support the argument they pertain to. This means you can most definitely also raise a point on the speeches of countries you worked and wrote together with in order to strengthen their point or express agreement. However, these points can quickly become annoying and chairs do not look favourably on them if they don't add to the debate. Ideally, you should stick to only using them in two possible scenarios: Either if the person you are agreeing with wasn't previously someone you sided with but that convinced your delegation in their speech, to signal to the rest of the house that they persuaded you and invite others to side with them as well. Or, if you are supporting something you were already agreeing with, there should be a point you add yourself, such as a further argument they missed in their speech or an argument that only your country is privy to, based on their knowledge and history. Either way, remember to phrase it as a question, such as: „We fully agree with (….), because (….), Is the Delegation aware of our support?"

   As you can see, there are many ways of phrasing a Point of Information. At its heart, they are a part of debate that can only be studied in debate and need practice. If you are familiar with their basic structure, importance for the flow of debate and the versatile ways they can be utilized, you are well prepared.

   As an exercise, try listening to the speeches linked in the section on speeches or consider POIs which you would raise in reaction to your own speech.
   Try phrasing 4 kinds of POI for each speech, as listed above.

2. 3 Writing Amendments

Amendments are ways to change or strike a clause completely and have a huge weight in the course of a debate, often ultimately making up the difference between a passing resolution or a failed one. Amendments are always submitted during open debate. After submitting your amendment, you get an allotted time (usually 1 minute) to explain your reasoning and thought process in writing it and then it will be debated on the floor before eventually being voted on overall.

Amendments are the main way of working on the Resolution during debate, besides speeches which are equally important but don't alter the Resolution itself. Since it is your explicit goal to work on and decide over the Resolutions, writing and submitting Amendments is vital to the process of debate. However, since they belong into the context of debate, it is difficult to pre-write them.

There are three types of Amendments, which function wholly differently:

Amending to Add
This Amendment proposes to add a clause to the resolution (during open debate on the resolution as a whole) or a subclause to an existing clause (during debate on a specific clause). This is the only way to add content during debate, as anything that hasn't been submitted during Lobbying to be part of the Resolution will not be considered otherwise.

Full clauses:
Amendments to add that are full clauses follow the same exact structure as a clause, meaning they should be written as such.
These Amendments are extremely useful for having the chance to present a stance or agenda that your lobbying group may not agree with or push through an agenda that your country supports alone. However, since the first time your peers will review this clause is in actual debate, you should be extraordinarily well prepared to defend this clause.

Subclauses or individual terms:
Adding to an already existing clause already in debate through a subclause is ever so slightly different from adding a full clause. The main thing to consider is the intention of the original clause, if it aligns with your goal and if it can be improved upon through an addition. Usually, this is done in order to further specify a clause that already covers a good ground, such as adding extra examples. Your addiction should be beneficial to the clause as a whole and either serve yourself or the whole comittee, as additions like this never pass without good reason.

An example for this kind of Amendment would be a clause calling for more funding for certain kinds of institutions and the amendment asking to add extra kinds of institutions in order to cover more ground:

„1. <u>Recommends</u> all member states reinvestigate their funding of important infrastructure in zones affected by lack of responsible resource management and ensure the development of further staff for institutions such as but not limited to:

a) government offices
b) schools
c) churches, mosques and other places of worship"

This clause fundamentally calls for a reassessment of the funding of important architecture and for better development of these institutions. It may appear on topics such as corruption and spending in the ECOSOC or GAs. A delegate concerned with healthcare may choose to try and

add a subclause d), listing hospitals. If they can properly defend their addition, the clause will become as follows:

„1. Recommends all member states reinvestigate their funding of important infrastructure in zones affected by lack of responsible resource management and ensure the development of further staff for institutions such as but not limited to:

a) *government offices*
b) *schools*
c) *churches, mosques and other places of worship*
d) *hospitals“*

Amending to Strike

Amending to replace/alter

Special cases:
„Friendly“ Amendments:
Amendments deemed as „friendly“ are those who are submitted in order to clarify or simplify a clause without changing the content of the clause and can be accepted by the main submitter without further debate. This only works if there is absolutely no change to the actual content, as this kind of change would need to be debated. Though not usually an official term of BALMUN procedure, they occur sometimes and can be helpful. If one wishes to submit such an amendment, they should clarify that they deem it a „friendly“ amendment to avoid unnecessary discussion.

Amendments to the second Degree:
During debate on Amendments, especially those to add a clause, there may be amendments raised on that first amendment. These are referred to as Amendments to the second degree and may be entertained at the discretion of the chair. Keep in mind that they are not per default friendly Amendments. All friendly Amendments are Amendments to the 2nd Degree but not all Amendments to the 2nd Degree are friendly Amendments.

3. Practical debate skills

3. 1 How to spot and recognise fallacies

A fallacy is a false believe or false logical argument, often those which come up during a debate. Though it may take some time to understand these patterns enough to be able to

navigate around them in actual debate, it is imperative you learn to spot them and know how to answer to them.
For this, you must understand two important terms:
Bad faith and **good faith** arguments.
"**Bad Faith**" refers to arguments or opponents that don't have any true interest in debating, discussing and coming up with solutions to the topics at hand, but rather have an alternative goal in mind, such as stalling for time or simply agitating you. They are not interested in changing their mind, conceding losses or proving their statements. **A bad faith opponent is fundamentally useless to engage with, because they are fundamentally opposed to finding common ground.**

"Good faith" refers to the opposite of that, meaning any constructive and genuine approach to debate. **In general, you should assume good faith until proven otherwise**, as even an opponent that seems uninterested in constructive debate may simply be confused, tired or, especially in the case of international debates, struggle to understand you due to a language barrier. Only when you have reliably identified that your opponent argues in bad faith should you consider other tactics, such as bringing it to the attention of the Chairs and audience or disengaging entirely.

For a very detailed video series on bad faith arguments in American conservative politics that showcases this difference and a few of the fallacies explained below, I recommend The Alt-right Playbook by Innuendo Studios. Note that it deals with socio-political issues not necessarily relevant to MUN and is presented in advanced English not suited for everyone.

Fallacies are part of bad faith arguments, meaning arguments that aren't meant to contribute
Below are a list of the most common fallacies and a response to them:

Name: Ad Hominem
What it is: From the latin phrase for "to the person", it is exactly what it says- These kinds of arguments attack the person directly instead of engaging with their arguments. In MUN, these only occur rarely. Since everyone knows that you may not address the delegate as a person, but only in the function of their country, it should never happen that someone attacks you based on any of your personal qualities.
In MUN, attacks towards your country may also be comparable to an Ad Hominem. Keep in mind that pointing out flaws in your countries policy that are current, relevant and factually correct are not Ad Hominems.
Example: "I'm not sure we should be listening to a delegate that can't even come to debate on time."
An example for an Ad Hominem against your country may be: "If the delegation really cares about womens rights so much, why don't they put a ban on their rampant make-up industry, which promotes insecurity in women?"
Counter: Should this happen and your Chairs do not immediately act, you should immediately raise a Point of Personal Privilege and ask for an apology. It shows poor sportsmanship and is

not to be tolerated. This goes especially for any comments towards a delegates race, gender, identity, ability or background.
For country-based Ad Hominem, the best counter is to point out that their argument has no bearing on the actual issue at hand and can be addressed another way.

Name: Strawman Argument
What it is: Strawman arguments create an exaggerated or untrue view of another persons point to make it easier to tear down or point out flaws in their argument. It is a purposeful distortion of the facts of debate, creating a "strawman", a weak replacement argument to avoid engaging in the actual point of the opponent.
Example:
A: "School lunches should be free."
B: "So what you're saying is we should just get rid of cafeterias where students can buy snacks? What if they want a chocolate bar on their break, you can't restrict freedom like that."
Counter: Since in debate, these kinds of issues can easily occur due to misunderstandings, it is best to assume good faith. This means that when faced with a Strawman of your argument, you should restate your original position as clearly and concisely as possible, to make sure there is no possible way your opponent or the audience can mistake the Strawman for your actual position. Then, challenge or ask your opponent to engage with the real traits of your argument, after demonstrating what they were leaving on the table.

Name: Post Hoc ("Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc" translating to "after this, therefore because of this") or False Causality Argument/"Non sequitor" Arguments/"Correlation, not Causation"
What it is: A Post Hoc fallacy assumes that because one event happened before or in relation to another event, one must be the cause of the other. In a similar vein, "Correlation, not Causation" may be brought up, essentially stating that just because two events are linked in some way, it doesn't mean that one caused the other. In contrast to "Correlation, not Causation", however, a Post Hoc fallacy doesn't require the events to link at all. These Arguments may also be known as "Non sequitor" arguments, which mean "not following" and refer, again, to any chain of logic that is actually missing vital pieces.
Example: An obvious example: The more lemons are imported from Mexico into the US, the fewer fatal crashes occur on american roads (Source)
When used in debate, Post Hoc fallacies may be more hidden and require research to properly identify. For example, someone may claim that in recent years, there have been more trans people than ever before. Research and critical thinking reveals that there are not actually more, but similarly to the influx in left handed people after a reduction of stigma against them, it is simply a matter of more people freely and publicly expressing themselves.
Counter: During debate, fact-checking every statement is impossible. However, a healthy amount of common sense, a general education and critical thinking can help in training yourself to detect these kinds of arguments. When a statistic is linked or a point is made, ask yourself if the repercussions of such a fact seem probable and if there are other possible explanations for the developments portrayed. Lastly, always ask who is served by making such points and

bringing up certain statistics - What morality is implied, what motivation is pursued? A counter argument will naturally build from there, or, alternatively, from disproving the link if possible.

Name: False Dichotomy fallacy
What it is: In heated or highly controversial topics, a debater may attempt to boil down a complex issue to one rather simple yes or no, pro or contra, kind of argument. While sometimes productive and useful for simplifying a topic and reaching a conclusion, this Fallacy assumes that there are two opposing or black-and-white sides that simply do not exist and force the audience or the opposition to make a decision that does not hold true merit for the debate.
It is important that the two options are presented as collectively exhaustive, meaning they completely encompass all other possibilities and also mutually exclusive, meaning you cannot be of either position.
Example: "Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists." (Quote by G. Bush, former US President)
Counter: The only way to deal with such a line of argument is to refuse to be forced into the choice between one side or the other. Calmly and clearly restate your actual position and point out which complexities of the issue are not addressed by either of the extreme sides. There is usually huge oversights in having to choose between one or another snappy answer instead of giving proper room. In the complex political issues which we discuss as part of MUN, there are always shades of gray. The real world has no true black-and-white issues, by principle.

Name: Ad Ignorantiam ("For Ignorance") or Burden-of-Proof reversal fallacy
What it is: When an argument is posed or a statement is made, this statement needs to be proven in order to be useful in debate. "Burden of Proof" refers to the responsibility of proving such a claim, which always lies with the side which made the argument in the first place. This Fallacy relies on assuming that a claim has not been disproven and is therefore true until disproven, meaning the person posing it relies on their opponent to bear the "Burden of Proof".
Example: Fundamentalist christians will often claim that since Science cannot disprove the existence of a god, he either definitely exists or is likely to exists. Since Christianity makes the claim that their god exists, they have the "Burden of Proof" in showing evidence of his existence. Asking Science to disprove their point means they reverse the Burden of Proof.
Counter: Calling out this fallacy and asking the opposite side to show the proof for their claims is usually the most effective way of tackling the issue, though it isn't usually very elegant to simply retort with something as simple as "No, YOU prove it.". Instead, it may be more elegant to not engage entirely.

A good overview of more logical fallacies (31 fallacies summarised in 8 minutes) can be found here. It is recommended to watch this video and broadly familiarize yourself with them.
Further, more specific logical fallacies such as the conjunction fallacy and the slippery slope fallacy can be found in the videos linked.

Using Fallacies in debate:
When studying debate techniques, it may occur that many "debate tricks" given on various websites, in certain courses or by fellow debaters essentially parallel these fallacies and seem

to be using them for your side, instead of training you to stop them. For example, the “slippery slope fallacy”, which wrongly posits that something simple will automatically lead to something worse over time, finds its logical counterpart in the common strategy to point out possible future consequences in an opponent's logic. This demonstrates that even good debaters will rely on fallacies to get their point across. At heart, debate is about persuading the audience, in the case of MUN, your fellow delegates, and sometimes your opponent, not necessarily about portraying the full scope of truthful reality. Still, it is not advisable to rely on fallacies to make your point, as they have, at heart, logical issues that can easily be pointed out. A sound, proven, logical argument is preferable. Persuasive or manipulative tricks should be considered carefully.