National Forensic League

Novice Lincoln Douglas Debate Curriculum

Created in conjunction with the NFL Lincoln Douglas Debate Committee

By Joe Vaughan, Scarsdale High School
edited by Pam Cady Wycoff, Apple Valley High School

© 2008 National Forensic League

© 2008 National Forensic League

Preface

The following set of lesson plans are meant as guidelines only. They are not meant to be an authoritative structure as to how to teach the activity but a logical framework as to how one could help students understand what LD is all about. Please feel free to adapt these lessons to the unique needs of your classroom, students and teaching style.

The document has broken up the lessons into definable skills. The lessons are presented in a specific order to lead the students to understand the logic of argumentation before the specific LD format and structure is introduced. A lesson could take one day or a few days depending on the richness of the classroom discussion and how quickly the students are picking up the concepts. Each lesson should be tailored to fit the speed and experience level of the class. The order is what is important, not a rigid adherence to a specific time schedule.

Table of Contents:

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 1: What is an argument?

Objective: To understand the formal "claim/warrant/impact" structure of an argument.

When the students walk in the room, have a statement of concern on the board that asks them to take a position on a topic of local concern, such as a school issue or a community issue. For example:

1) Our school ought to have a more stringent dress code
2) Student parking privileges should be contingent on academic performance.
3) All students should be required to do community service.

You can use these or create your own based on something that the students will find immediate and relevant so that they have a definite opinion on the topic. Try to pick something that you believe will have a diversity of student opinion.

Poll the students to see who is in favor of the statement and who disagrees with the statement. Use this to separate the students into groups based on their opinion. Split the students into groups of 3 or 4 members with the same opinion on the topic.

Direct each group to come up with 3 arguments to support their side of the topic. Tell them to be sure to have a reason WHY they think their arguments are true. Have each group write down their arguments and their reasons why they are true.

After each small group has their three arguments, have all the groups that were arguing in favor of the statement meet together and all of the groups arguing against the statement meet together. Appoint one student to be the moderator of each of the two groups. Each small group should present their arguments to the larger group. After this, each large group should discuss the ideas and decide the strongest three arguments for their side.

(NOTE: The above activity does not necessarily have to be done in the group format described. However it can be advantageous to determine how the individuals function in smaller groups, how the students relate to each other and how well they can operate independently from direct instruction. During these group meetings, the teacher can be visiting with each group to gain a sense of his or her students.)

After the groups have decided their arguments, convene back to the whole class. Have each moderator present the three arguments that his or her side agreed upon as being the strongest. It is very important that this is prefaced by stating that while the other side is presenting, students keep their comments to themselves. This is not a time for arguing…this is a time for reporting. Record each of these three arguments on the board. If the student gives reasons why they believe that argument to be true, write them under the argument they supports.

Inevitably, some of the arguments will be underdeveloped in terms of why they are true. The teacher should probe the students to ask why their arguments are true and record these reasons on the board. Once each argument has been fleshed out, the next step is to ask the

© 2008 National Forensic League

students why each of the arguments is important or how each of the arguments explicitly supports their side.

After each argument has been completed, the teacher should ask the students what are the structural commonalities of all of the arguments. After a bit of discussion, the students should be led to answer that:

1) each argument makes a statement of a possible truth, then
2) gives support for that argument in terms of some reason why this argument is true, and
3) explicitly explains the importance of this argument in terms of how the argument proves their position true or how the implication of the argument affects people.

Students should then be introduced to the terms "claim," "warrant," and "impact," which correlate with the three ideas above. The teacher should then lead a discussion as to why an argument needs all three of these (i.e., why is a claim with an impact but without a warrant not a good argument, what is problematic about having a claim and warrant without an impact, etc).

If there is time, students can also be introduced to the different ways in which they can warrant their arguments such as:

1) analytical warrants, which are logical reasons for the truth of the argument
2) empirical warrants, which are example and statistics from real world examples
3) psychological warrants, which usually describe incentive structures for how people tend to act in certain situations and are often backed up with psychological studies

Note: The teacher should keep a record of the three arguments created by each side as well as the warrants and impacts given. These might be helpful for further exercises or for a common reference to remind the students about this day's lesson.

Homework: At the end of this lesson, the current LD debate resolution should be introduced. Students should be asked to come up with two arguments IN FAVOR of this resolution. Tell them that when they write down their arguments, they should use the "claim/warrant/impact" structure and explicitly label each part of the argument. The teacher can use the attached worksheet below to enforce the concept.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Resolution

Argument for the (circle one): AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE

Claim:

Warrant(s):

Impact:

Argument for the (circle one): AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE

Claim:

Warrant(s):

Impact:

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 2: How do you affirm and negate a statement of value?

Objectives: To understand what a statement of value is.
To understand what must be done to adequately support a statement of value.

Teacher Prep: The teacher needs to have the definitions of all of the key terms of the current LD resolution on hand. Additionally, it might be helpful to go to www.nflonline.org, go to the "resources" tab, then to "topics" and download the list of archived topics for additional examples.

Homework review: The teacher could have a few students present one of their two arguments. The class could then discuss whether or not the student has effectively used the "claim/warrant/impact" structure. Students should be told that the point of the critique is NOT to agree or disagree with the arguments but to see if the student presenting has each part of the structure and each part of the argument logically follows (i.e. do they have the appropriate warrant to back up that particular claim, etc). The teacher could also collect the homework. The teacher could also put the students in smaller groups to do the critique described above. If the teacher does this, one example critique should be done for the whole class so that the students understand what they are doing.

Lesson:

Introduce the students to the idea of "a statement of value." Ask them what they think this means. Often a good clarifying question asks the students to explain the difference between a "statement of value" and a "statement of fact." The students should eventually come to the notion that a statement of value is more about what ought to be true rather than what is true. They should also come up with the idea that statements of value tend to reference larger metaphysical concepts such as "justice" and "morality" rather than being concerns of everyday politics and society. Additionally, students will probably bring up the idea that statements of value tend to be more subjective as different people/cultures value different things whereas facts are more objective. If students are having difficulty with this, ask them to define the word "value" and list a few things that most people value.

Once the students have a handle on this concept, transition into the question, "What does it mean to stand in support of, or affirm, a statement of value?" At this point, it would be helpful to discuss the difference between proving a statement true versus affirming a statement of value. Ask the students what is the relevant distinction between the two. It is important that the student understand that to declare a statement true means that the speaker is making a categorical (or absolute) statement about the resolution. Lead them to understand that if the affirmative had this burden, they would have to prove that there are NO exceptions to the statement under any context as one exception would undermine the absolute truth of the resolution. Instead they need to understand that the affirmative needs to show that the statement is true "as a matter of principal" or as a general case and, though there might be small exceptions, these exceptions aren't so large as to invalidate the overall claim being made. Therefore, to negate a resolution means to prove, on balance or in an overriding portion of situations, that the action that the resolution posits violates the nature of the evaluative method supplied by the resolution. Additionally, the negative should show that the specific arguments

© 2008 National Forensic League

provided by the affirmative debater are either not sufficient to uphold the resolution or are not true in and of themselves.

Next, write the resolution on the board. Ask the students, "What would we need to logically prove or know to affirm or negate this resolution?" The students will most likely begin by giving arguments in support of the resolutions. This is not what is being asked here. This question is attempting to get the students to understand what *burdens* are placed upon the affirmative debater due to the text of the resolution. The students should be led to understand that in order to know how to stand in support of the resolution, they must first analyze the text of the resolution effectively.

An effective textual analysis includes the following:

1) an understanding of the definitions of the words in the resolution,
2) an understanding of the type of resolution at hand,
3) an understanding of the context, if any, provided by the resolution,
4) an understanding of the actor and action of the resolution, and
5) a recognition of the evaluative term of the resolution

The first step is to understand the definitions of the words in the resolution. Begin by asking the students for definitions of the key terms in the resolution. After they give an adequate notion of each term, write the exact dictionary definition (looked up beforehand) on the board. Be careful of "terms of art," which are phrases that have very specific meanings in specific contexts (e.g. "due process" is a legal term meaning the set of procedural safeguards that prevent the government from overriding individual rights but the words due and process individually would be nonsensical. Recent past resolutions have included such terms of art as "separation of church and state," "judicial activism" and "eminent domain").

Second, students need to be able to identify the type of the resolution. There are three main categories of resolutions:

1) comparative ("x" is more desirable than "y"),
2) absolute ("x action" is just), and
3) superlative ("x" is the best form of government)

Before trying to determine what type of resolution your class is dealing with, it is a good idea to have a quick discussion on the differences between these resolution types as each type of resolution carries with it different burdens.

- Generally, comparative resolutions require the students to examine both ideas that are in contrast and explain the comparative benefits of one of the two options. Many students will just try to give reasons why the option they have to uphold is good but the burden of these resolutions is to show why one ought to preference one thing as opposed to another thing. This could mean that the students have to show why benefits of the option they are upholding are comparably better than the benefits of the other option and that the harms of their side are not as severe as the harms of the opposing side.

© 2008 National Forensic League

- Absolute resolutions ask the students to uphold a general principle and prove that it is, on balance, correct. This means that students will have to prove that in most cases the action or idea being put forward is correct.
- Superlative resolutions are fairly rare as they ask students to defend some notion as being preferable to all other options. To affirm such a resolution, students are going to have to really focus on the advantages of the notion being advanced and be able to explain why the possible harms are not that important.

Once each resolution type has been discussed, ask the students what type of resolution the resolution that you are studying is. Be sure to ask them what textual clues point to this.

Next, some resolutions posit specific contexts such as "in the United States," "in the US judicial system," or "when in conflict." Ask the students what the purpose of such clauses could be. Does this resolution provide a specific context? In what way do these contexts seem to limit or narrow the debate? How do these contexts clarify the conflict of the resolution? How do these contexts suggest burdens for what the affirmative or negative debater has to prove?

Next, students need to be able to identify who that actor of the resolution is and what action that actor is being asked to do by the resolution. The actor is the agent/person/entity that will presumably carry out the action in the affirmative world. Common actors in Lincoln Douglas resolutions include "a government," "the US government," "the individual," "society," "the international community," "the UN," "the US judicial system," among others. The actor is crucial to understanding the scope of the resolution. Sometimes the actor of the resolution is explicitly stated but other times it is implied and therefore open to interpretation. Whereas in the resolution "The United States has a moral obligation to mitigate international conflicts," it is clear that the US federal government is the logical actor, in the resolution "Civil disobedience in a democracy is morally justified," the issue of the actor is a little more unclear. The actor could be the individual who is deciding whether or not to be civilly disobedient or a society in terms of society's mores and values. Additionally, the action of the resolution is critical. This is what the agent will do in the affirmative world. In the past two resolutions, the actions are "mitigat[ing] international conflicts" and "civil disobedience" respectfully. The combination of these two specifies the resolution and should act to limit the scope of topical arguments. Have the students identify the actor and action of the resolution you are examining.

Finally, students need to examine the evaluative term or phrase of the resolution. Evaluative terms are those that pose the moral, legal or ethical question of the resolution. For example, in each of the resolutions below, the evaluative term is bolded:

- It is **morally permissible** to kill one innocent person to save the lives of more innocent people.
- In the United States, jury nullification **is a legitimate check** on government.
- International lenders **ought** to cancel the debt of highly indebted poor countries.
- Capitalism is **the most just** form of economic system.

In each of these examples, the bolded term informs how the resolution should be thought about. For example, with the first resolution, the question is not whether the action posed by the resolution is "good" or "right" but whether a coherent system of morality could permit such an action to be endorsed. For the second resolution, the question is whether or not the action of the resolution functions as a check on government action and whether that check is

© 2008 National Forensic League

legitimate in the context of a democratic republic. Feel free to use these examples as a starting point. Once you feel students have a handle on the concept of an evaluative term, refer back to the resolution you will be studying and ask the students what the evaluative term of this resolution is. Ask the students what implications this evaluative term has (i.e., what types of arguments are unimportant when trying to decide the conflict posed by the resolution).

Now that the resolution itself has been analyzed, students can be led to understand what it means to affirm or negate a statement of value since they should understand all of the parts of the statement of value. Pose once again the question, "What would we need to logically prove or know to affirm or negate this resolution?" Lead the students away from arguments and examples but towards outlining what logically must be proven to affirm or negate the resolution. It may be a good idea to break the students into groups for them to have this discussion before bringing them together as a class to gather opinions. Once you feel students know the difference between *arguments that affirm or negate* the resolution versus *the ideas that frame how a resolution can be affirmed or negated*, the class is ready to proceed.

Homework: Give the students a list of four or five old resolutions from the list downloaded from www.nflonline.org. They either can pick one of these, or a certain number of students can be assigned each one. For the resolution they choose/are assigned, they should:

- Define important terms
- State what type of resolution it is and why they think so
- State what context, if any is provided, and one way in which that resolution limits the scope of the resolution
- State the actor and action of the resolution
- State the evaluative term of the resolution.
- Write one or two sentences that explain what it would mean to affirm the resolution and one or two sentences that explain what it would mean to negate the resolution. These sentences could use some of the words of the resolution but students should try to rephrase the ideas using their own words as much as possible.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 3: Refutation

Objective: To learn about the different types of ways to refute an opponent's arguments.

Lesson:

Using the arguments generated from Lesson 1, select one affirmative argument to place on the board. Ask the students to individually write down three responses to this argument. After a few minutes, have the students share their responses with the class. Write their responses on the board. After the students have exhausted unique responses, ask the students if certain responses have common traits. Ask the students to identify common types of responses and what is common about them. Use the list below as a reference for some of the common types of responses.

After going through the responses offered by the students, present these additional types of responses below. Be prepared with examples to illustrate these types of responses with the resolution you used for the introductory discussion.

- Countering the truth of the original argument presented by giving counter evidence or examples.
- Pointing out the missing steps in their logic. This doesn't just mean noting that the original argument is making assumptions, but pointing out what those assumptions are and saying why they are wrong.
- Pointing out that the argument does not have a warrant, meaning a clear reason why this argument is true.
- Explaining why the argument is "**non-unique**." This means that the refutation points out that the problem cited by the original argument will inevitably occur and therefore neither side can uniquely claim an advantage of solving this problem.
- The argument is not comparative. This means that it points out some particular problem but does not explain why their side of the resolution is any better with regards to this issue, meaning they have no unique advantage.
- Against theoretical arguments, raise an empirical (essentially meaning real world) objection as to why this won't happen in the real world.
- Against empirical arguments, explain how the examples cited can be explained by non-inherent factors that don't apply in the case of the resolution's conflict scenario
- Even if the claim they are making is true, it is not relatively important. There are a few relative measures that can be employed. They can say the argument is not important due to
    - the **probability** that that the claim would happen being small
    - the scope or **magnitude** of the argument being small, meaning that the problem they cite would not affect that many people or the benefit they are claiming would not help that many people
    - the **time frame** on which the argument operates being either too short term to really help or happening to slowly or too far in the future to solve the problem presented.

These types of arguments are called **weighing** arguments. They are quite valuable for comparing relative claims. Weighing will be discussed in more detail in the next lesson.

© 2008 National Forensic League

- Citing a logical fallacy being made by the argument. Some of the common logical fallacies are
    - the causation/correlation fallacy. This means that the argument is confusing two things that occur simultaneously with one thing that occurs due to another thing.
    - the naturalistic fallacy, also called the "is/ought" fallacy. This is when an argument rests upon the assumption that just because something happens in a certain way in today's world that it ought to always happen in that way.
    - begging the question. This is another way of saying the argument is circular meaning that the argument assumes premises that assume the conclusion of the argument.
    - the false dilemma. This type of argument puts two options in opposition to each other and forces a choice between these two options but ignores other potential options.

All of the above response types can be classified as DEFENSIVE refutations. This means they are in some way trying to deny the veracity of the claim or render the claim unimportant. If the refuter wins these types of arguments they have simply denied their opponent the ability to win using these arguments.

Offensive responses are called, in Lincoln Douglas, **turns**. Turns concede the premise or warrant of the argument being made but explain why this premise or warrant is a reason to vote for the refuter's side. There are two general types of turns:

- Link Turn – This type of turn changes the causality of the argument. There are several different types of link turns as illustrated below:
    - the affirmative says X is bad; the negative concedes that X is bad but argues that X actually prevents the bad thing the affirmative is claiming will occur.
    - the affirmative says X is bad; the negative concedes that X is bad and argues that the affirmative actually causes X to occur.
- Impact turn – This type of turn reverses the outcome of the argument.
    - the affirmative claims that X action which occurs in the negative world is bad; the negative concedes that X will happen in the negative world but argues that X is actually good
    - the affirmative claims X is a good that happens in the affirmative world; the negative concedes X happens in the affirmative world but argues that X is bad.

These arguments are more difficult to make than defensive responses but are eminently preferable as, if the student is winning these types of arguments, they become reasons to vote FOR that student.

As an exercise, take one or two more of the individual arguments from the previous lesson and have the students write responses to these arguments. Ask them to make at least three defensive responses and two offensive responses against each argument. It is probably best to do this in pairs. After the students write these responses, have the students share their responses with the class. Have the class identify what exact type of response each is.

© 2008 National Forensic League

When responding to arguments in a debate round, students should be prepared to make a variety of responses. This is sometimes called "making an argument package." This combines multiple defensive responses and offensive responses to individual arguments. A student would not necessarily use each response always as some of the responses contradict each other (you couldn't for example "non-unique" an argument and then turn that argument since the whole point of a turn is to derive a unique benefit from the argument. Additionally, you wouldn't want to both link turn and impact turn the same argument).

For homework, have students write "argument packages" to the remaining arguments from that first activity. Require them to have at least three defensive arguments and 2 offensive arguments for each argument. Have them label the type of argument that they are using.

As a side note, this method of pre-preparing arguments by writing attacks ahead of time to common arguments is called "**blocking**" an argument. Having blocks prepped before debating greatly reduces stress and increases a student's options.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 4: Responding to Attacks

Objective: To learn how to respond to opponents' attacks and then advance One's own arguments.

Lesson:

Begin by reviewing the homework from the night before. Select a few sample arguments and their refutations. Record the original argument on the board and a selection of student responses. Ask the students how they would respond to these responses. Hopefully what they will find is that many responses fall into the same fallacies and issues that were described in the past lesson. Most students, when responding to attacks, will simply try to reiterate the original claim that they made. This becomes inordinately frustrating. Here are some suggestions for students to think about when responding to attacks:

- Was the response actually responsive to the original claim and warrant? Often, responses will not be directly responsive to the actual argument made. Usually the response responds to the general claim but ignores the specific warrant given for that claim. If the exact warrant given isn't specifically addressed, the student can easily say that the response was "non-responsive" and then explain what specific idea the response misunderstood or missed.
- When multiple responses are made to a single argument, many of these responses rely on the same premise. A student can "**group**" these arguments and attack the basic premise of all of these arguments rather than refuting each individually.
- Some of the responding techniques are fairly obvious as the response almost begs the student to fill in some missing detail:
  - If the attack is of the "non-unique" type, try to explain the uniqueness of the warrant or impact of the argument.
  - If the attack is of the "weighing" type, try to explain how the argument is more important using that same weighing mechanism or is more important with respect to a different weighing mechanism. This becomes tricky, though, as the student would also have to explain why this new weighing mechanism is more important in evaluating this implication than the original one offered.
  - If the student claims that the original argument falls into one of the fallacies, explain why the argument avoids that fallacy.

To practice this skill of responding to attacks, split the students up into pairs. Pair up the pairs. Have one member of each pair take out a blank piece of paper. On this blank paper, have each pair pick one argument that they responded to the previous night. They should write the original argument at the top. They should then write their attacks to this argument below the argument but leave space (or several lines) between each of their responses. Each pair should then trade their paper with another pair. Each pair then should write responses to the attacks. After five minutes, have each group of four discuss the quality of the original attacks and the responses to these attacks. Which seemed to work? Which seemed not to work? Why? Once the conversation seems to be lagging, reconvene the class. Ask one group to volunteer what happened in their group and then poll the class as to when arguments and responses were most effective.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Once the class feels comfortable with responding to attacks, it is time to move on to extending the original argument. The whole point of responding to attacks is to beat back arguments so that the student can advance or "**extend**" his or her arguments. A good extension is patterned as follows:

- the student deals with all of the responses against their original argument
- the student then briefly extends the claim and warrant of the original argument
- the student then explains the implication of the argument
- in a round, the student would then go on to explain why this particular argument is important compared to other arguments (often using weighing-type language)

Once students have written cases, they should think about HOW they would extend their arguments if they are able to win them (i.e. they are able to beat back all of the responses against that arguments or if their opponent never responses to that argument). In fact, students can pre-write their extension. This will be demonstrated in the flowing lesson.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 5: Value Structure

Objectives: To understand the role of the value
To understand the role of the value criterion

Lesson:

This lesson will first introduce the idea of the value criterion and then the value. To introduce the value criterion, start the discussion by posing a relatively simple question about which students will have divergent opinions. It is best to keep this topic fairly light. Possibilities could include:

- What is the best restaurant in town?
- Who is the best baseball player?
- Who is the most reprehensible celebrity?

Allow students to offer their answers and record them on the board. There will (hopefully) be a few choices on the board. Ask the students how one could decide between these choices. List these different mechanisms for choosing between your choices on the board as well. There will probably be several different mechanisms suggested. Have a discussion about which of these mechanisms is the most important in deciding the questions and see if the group can come to a consensus. If they can, ask them to use the decided upon mechanism to first eliminate some choices and then see if this mechanism can be used to definitively choose one of the choices.

Once this discussion has run its course, introduce the term "Value Criterion" as a way or mechanism for choosing between many options, a way to weigh between competing options or a lens through which to narrow the scope of the question being asked. Lead students to understand that there are usually many valid Value Criteria to answer a given question, but some are superior to others.

To see if students understand the concept, ask another question like the one above. This time, rather than ask students to list possible answers, first ask them to come up with the best possible criterion for choosing between the options. Solicit suggestions from the class and list them on the board. Once a list has been completed, have the students answer the original question using each of the criteria listed. Students will (hopefully) come up with different answers to the question depending on which criterion is being used.

Introduce the idea that in an LD round, students will be proposing Value Criteria to answer the question of the resolution. They should understand that the purpose of this is for the student to offer the judge a way to evaluate the round. With this piece of information and the previous exercise, students should be led to understand that picking an effective Value Criterion is the key to controlling the arguments in a round because if they control the Value Criterion, they control which arguments will be important in the round. It is also important for students to understand that the Value Criterion should be something that both sides of the debate can use to answer the question of the resolution.

Now is the appropriate time to introduce the idea of the value. The value is the larger goal of the resolution or what the resolution is trying to achieve which is often suggested by

© 2008 National Forensic League

the phrasing of the resolution. Common values include but are not limited to "Justice," "Societal Welfare," "Protection of rights," "Human Worth," "Protection of Life" and "Fulfillment of Governmental Obligations" and "Governmental Legitimacy." It would be a good idea to draw a distinction between the types of questions offered in the previous activity, which are questions of fact, to LD resolutions which are questions of value. Where there is no larger value attempting to be achieved by the previous question, LD resolutions strive to answer some larger question.

Once this distinction has been drawn, use an old LD resolution, such as "The possession of nuclear weapons is immoral" to discuss the value. Ask the students what larger questions are being asked by this resolution. Reflecting on these questions, ask the students to come up with an appropriate value for this resolution. Students generally come up with ideas such as protection of life or justice or fulfillment of governmental obligations or some variation on these. After discussion, get the students to decide on which of the suggestions would be best.

Students should now brainstorm an appropriate value criterion to measure these values. In other words, they have to pick some way to decide whether a debater can achieve the value. For example, if the students decide upon protection of life as the most important value because the resolution questions if possessing the destructive power of nuclear weapons is worth the potential risk, the question becomes how one could decide which action prevents the most loss of life. A possible value criterion then could be "minimizing the risk of nuclear war" or "minimizing harm to innocent lives." Suggest to the students that since value criteria are supposed to help evaluate between competing arguments, that value criteria are usually verb phrases. Value criteria that are simply nouns are problematic because they do not tell a judge how to evaluate any of the arguments. Additionally, many value criteria use ideas like "maximizing" and "minimizing" certain outcomes. It would be a good idea for students to come up with a few possible value criteria for each of the listed possible values.

The final piece of vocabulary the students need to know is the term "Value Structure" which is a general term that refers to the combination of the value and the value criterion.

Homework: Students should be assigned to come up with a value for the current resolution, an explanation for why they think that value would be appropriate, a value criterion to evaluate this value and a reason why this value criterion would be good mechanism for deciding between arguments.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 6: Debating Values and Criterion

Objectives: To understand how to argue the supremacy of a value
To understand how to undermine an opponent's value criterion

Lesson:

Begin by reviewing the previous night's homework. Poll the students to see what values they used. Many of the students will probably have the same values. Write these on the board, leaving space underneath each value. Once you have a few values on the board, ask the students their reasons for choosing each value and write those on the board.

Next, for each value, ask the students what value criterion they decided upon to measure this value. List these next to each appropriate value. Introduce the idea that in an LD round, each side will present a value and a value criterion to measure their value, therefore students must be ready to debate which value is most important as well as the appropriate value criterion to use to evaluate the round.

Point out to the students that in many rounds, there will probably not be a huge difference between values but if there is, the debaters should engage in a value clash. With the different values on the board, ask the students how one would choose between the values or argue for one value in favor of another. In this discussion, students will hopefully come up with (or should be led towards):

1) one value has a closer textual link to the resolution (i.e. the resolution explicitly suggests that value such as in the resolution "Resolved: Capitalism is the most just economic system.") and therefore that value is superior
2) one value more clearly illuminates the central conflict being posed by the resolution. To do this, students should cite what that central conflict is, explain why this issue is the central conflict of the resolution using the text of the resolution and explain how this value reflects the goal of resolving this conflict
3) the inferior value has no real link to the resolution
4) one value encompasses the other value and describes the totality of the resolutional conflict
5) one value encompasses too much and therefore obscures the resolutional conflict

Once these ideas have been developed, ask the students to break up into pairs. Assign each member of the pair a different value from the board so that half of the students have each value. Give the students a few minutes to individually come up with reasons why their assigned value is superior to their partner's assigned value. Have the partners then present to each other their arguments and have the partners discuss the strength of each argument. Bring the class back together and have students present which arguments they thought were strongest for each value. Discuss why these arguments were more effective than others.

Once these ideas have been explored, it is time to look at the value criteria. To do this, pick the most common value offered by the students or the value for which student came up with the greatest number of criteria. Now that students have seen how values can clash, discuss

© 2008 National Forensic League

how one would choose the best criterion for evaluating a given value. Have the students brainstorm ways to refute why a given value criterion is appropriate. Remind the students that a value criterion is supposed to explain how a debater can achieve the value and present a way for the judge to evaluate which arguments are important. Below is a list of common reasons a value criterion would be flawed or why another value criterion would be superior. In the discussion, students will hopefully come up with many of the things on this list and should be led towards the other reasons.

1) The proposed value criterion is circular with the value. This means that the value criterion is essentially the same thing as the value, and therefore doesn't help explain how one meets the value.
2) The proposed value criterion doesn't link to the value. This means that the value criterion doesn't really discuss what the value is about.
3) A different value criterion has a closer link to the value.
4) The proposed value criterion is too vague and therefore is not useful because it doesn't give a useful description of how one would know if they have fulfilled it
5) A different value criterion is a pre-requisite to the proposed value criterion. This means that one must first have do one value criterion in order to even think about achieving the proposed value criterion
6) The proposed value criterion isn't sufficient to reach the value. This means that even if a debater were able to fulfill this value criterion, the value wouldn't be reached because there are too many other things that would ALSO have to be done to reach the value.
7) The proposed value criterion isn't necessary to reach the value. This means that the value can be reached without ever considering what the proposed value criterion is referencing.
8) The proposed value criterion isn't measurable or weighable. This means that the proposed value criterion doesn't give any effective way to compare arguments.
9) The proposed value criterion lacks a bright line as to when it is reached. This means that this value criterion doesn't specify how much of the action must be taken to support one of the sides of the resolution.
10) The proposed value criterion is too broad and therefore isn't a useful way to evaluate arguments in the context of the resolution.
11) A different value criterion encompasses the proposed value criterion because the proposed value criterion doesn't address the totality of the resolution.

There are many other possible ways to argue between different value criteria, but these are among the most common and students should be familiar with these.

Pair the students again. Have each member of the pair pick a different value criterion under the same value and inform their partner which they have chosen. Have the students individually come up with reasons to prefer their criterion over their partner's. Have one member of the pair present their responses to the other member. The second partner should then take a minute and then respond to the attacks of his or her partner. Bring the class together and discuss which types of arguments seemed compelling and which seemed hard to use.

© 2008 National Forensic League

At this point, students will have all the basics of argumentation and an understanding of the types of issues that arise during value debate. It is now time to focus on the resolution at hand, leading the students towards constructing entire case positions, and presenting the structure of an LD round.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 7: Topic Briefing

Go to http://www.nflonline.org/StudentResources/Topics and click on "Topic Overview" under the Resources link to access the topic briefing lessons on the current resolution. Generally, there are three lessons available for understanding and introducing each new topic.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 8: Basic Structure of a Case

Objectives: To understand the basic structure of an affirmative and a negative case.

Materials: An old affirmative and an old negative case from a different resolution. (If you are new to the activity and do not have old cases, contact a school in your area that has an established LD program to help you out. If you do not know such a school, contact your District Chair to help put you in touch with such a program. The reason to use a different resolution is so students are not tempted to simply use sections of the sample case.) Additionally, at the end of this lesson is an old affirmative and negative case on the resolution "Resolved: Capitalism is the most just economic system." These cases were originally authored by Doug Lieb formerly of Scarsdale High School, NY.

Lesson:

Hand out the old affirmative case. Have the students read the case with the following prompt: Read this affirmative case with an eye to the structure of the case. As you are going through the case, identify the major structural elements of the case. To do this, mark off the beginning of each new section of the case.

Once the students have read the case, ask the students to name the case parts they have identified. Generally these are the sections they should note:

1) An opening quote or introductory statement (Some cases may not have this and start with simply "I affirm").
2) A statement of the resolution.
3) Definitions of key terms of the resolution.
4) Observations about the meaning of the resolution (Not all cases will have these).
5) The value and an explanation about why this is the appropriate value for this resolution.
6) The value criterion and an explanation about how the value criterion links to the value, the meaning of the value criterion and an explanation about how the value criterion can be used by the judge to evaluate the round.
7) Further observations (Often these are about what the affirmative does or does not have to defend or the appropriate burdens for both the affirmative and the negative debater. Not all cases will have these).
8) The thesis of the case (Not all cases will have this).
9) The contentions (Some cases will have multiple contentions, some will have only one).
    a. Tagline of the first contention which tells the basic claim of the first contention.
    b. There may be individual subpoints of the contention each with their own taglines which state the basic claim of that subpoint.
    c. Within each subpoint (or the contention itself if there are no subpoints), there will be a specific warrant (or multiple warrants) as to why the claim is true. These warrants may be analytical (logical reasons why the claim is true)

© 2008 National Forensic League

or empirical (using specific examples, statistics or studies to show the claim is true). These warrants can be either original authorship (something the student has written) or in the form of information from experts or institutions in the form of a quotation. This quotation is sometimes known as a "card" or evidence. The term "card" is a carryover from the days when debaters cut out their evidence and pasted it onto index cards.

d. At the end of each subpoint or contention, there should be an impact statement which describes the implication(s) of the argument. These impacts should clearly link the argument back to the value criterion selected by that student to show why winning this point helps him or her fulfill his or her value criterion. It is helpful to rhetorically link these impact statements to the rhetoric of the value criterion.

Sections 1 – 7 are known collectively as the "Value Structure" or "framework." Section 6 is sometimes known as the "Criteria Analysis." Sections 8 & 9 are sometimes known as the "Case Proper."

Once the students have identified each of these sections, it is time to discuss the importance of each of these sections. Lead the students to understand the following:

1) It is important to state the resolution because, as unfortunate as it may be, some judges come to tournaments not knowing the resolution.
2) Definitions and observations are important as they help narrow the scope of the debate and set a fair playing field so no one side has an impossible burden to fulfill. Ask the students to discuss, from the sample case, the strategic purpose of some of the observations and definitions. Try to get them to see what arguments the affirmative is trying to avoid and discuss whether or not it is reasonable for an affirmative in this resolution to avoid these issues.
3) That the value structure (or framework) serves two basic purposes; it helps the affirmative set the terms of the debate as well as gives the judge an effective evaluative framework for the round.
4) Show the students, from the sample, how the author of the case uses the "claim, warrant, impact" structure. To do this, have the student identify specific claims, the warrants for those claims and the implications. A quick exercise to do this would be to ask students to underline claims from the case in one color, warrants in another and impacts in a third color.
5) That having a clear organizational flow is really crucial. Note how the author delineates and transitions between these sections and the signposting these author does. Signposting often uses ordinal numbers and an outline-type formatting to cue the judge into the separation between sections.

Next, move onto the sample negative case. Repeat the initial exercise with the negative case. Once students have finished reading the case and marking off different sections, have a discussion comparing and contrasting the sample affirmative and negative cases. Lead the students to the following realizations:

1) Negative cases are much shorter than affirmative cases. Let them know there is a reason for this in terms of the structure of the debate round.

© 2008 National Forensic League

2) The framework of the negative case tends not to have definitions written into it. This is because the affirmative will be providing definitions. This does not mean the negative shouldn't have definitions in reserve in case the affirmative definitions are overly-biased towards the affirmative side. They are simply not written in to since many times the negative would simply have the same definitions so it would be a waste of time to reiterate.
3) The negative framework also will have observations, a value and a value criterion.
4) The negative case tends to have fewer contentions/subpoints but be structurally similar to the affirmative case.

Homework: Students should now begin case writing. This usually begins with a rough outline of both their affirmative and negative cases. This outline should hit upon all nine case sections outlined above. The outline maybe largely claims but that is fine. These outlines can be fleshed out over time to include their warrants and impacts.

On the following pages are sample cases that can be given to students so that they can see how the above skills can be integrated into a full case.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Affirmative Case

● "Free markets are an economic analog to [are like] a political system of majority rule without minority rights. The welfare state, from this perspective, is a device to assure[s] that a minority that is deprived by markets is treated with minimum economic concern and respect." Because I agree with political theorist Jack Donnelly, I affirm. Limiting economic inequality ought to be a more important social goal than maximizing economic freedom.

● To limit means to confine. Much like a speed limit does not force cars to stop, a limit on economic inequality does not eradicate wealth disparities, so affirming does not necessitate socialism. Rather, it creates an acceptable disparity between society's richest and poorest members.

● The Dictionary of Business Terms defines economic freedom as "freedom from [government] regulation or other dictates from government or other authority in economic affairs. [1]" Oxford English Dictionary defines "maximize" as "to make as great as possible". So, maximizing economic freedom means progressively deregulating the market.

● A goal is an objective, not an end state of affairs. The resolution asks not whether we achieve either goal, but which we should prioritize when the two conflict.

● Since the resolution asks society to prioritize a goal, the value is a just social order. As justice means giving each person her due, a just social order must respect what fundamentally *makes* her an individual. This inherent worth stems from her ability to self-govern, since the ability to make choices delineates us as human. The criterion is maximizing respect for agency, which means letting people make choices in accordance with their life plans, so long as they don't

[1] Dictionary of Business Terms (2000) *Barron's Educational Series, Inc.* – Ellipsis out "(business)"

© 2008 National Forensic League

harm others. Because the resolution offers a choice between two social goals, this criterion is comparative—whoever provides more people access to agency wins. Also, this standard is logically prior to any needs or rights-based standard, since those goods are meaningless unless people can choose how to use them.

● My thesis is that all citizens deserve equal access to agency, regardless of arbitrary characteristics. Affirming maximizes respect for agency by redistributing wealth for the benefit of disadvantaged groups.

● My first contention is that limiting economic inequality trumps maximizing freedom because doing so respects the agency of those disadvantaged arbitrarily. No one is due arbitrary harm, so a just society should intervene in situations where such harm occurs. One's ability to succeed economically depends on non merit-based factors beyond her control, such as genetic composition and class. For instance, I may lack a job simply due to a physical or mental handicap. The free market bases economic success on such arbitrary factors, as Robert Simon explains in <u>The Individual and the Political Order</u>:

> The market provides no protection for those whose skills are not in demand[,] [nor]. It also provides no protection for persons who through no fault of their own cannot make a contribution to the economy—for example, the ill (both physically and mentally), [and] unemployed, and those who must care for young children, as well as the children themselves. The market, therefore, is not sufficient to honor every citizen's human right to well-being.

It's impossible for people to fulfill their life choices or voice political opinions when they are more worried about where their next meal will come from. MOREOVER, negating makes this problem inescapable, since benefits from the free market never trickle down to the poor. Simon writes:

© 2008 National Forensic League

> The unfettered market provides the greatest gross national product from which rights to well-being can be implemented. But, individuals receive economic reward if and only if a) they have contributed to the productive process or b) they are voluntarily supported by a producer. To the extent that individuals are unable, through no fault of their own, to contribute to [this] the productive process, this distributive process [it] is unfair.

Limiting economic inequality corrects for this injustice by including people who would otherwise be excluded, guaranteeing *all* individuals certain goods, services, and opportunities irrespective of their labor's market value.

My second contention is that the market violates the agency of even those who manage to gain access to it, requiring state intervention. Because the market dictates which goods and services are valuable, it forces people to adhere to a specific ideology if they want to be wealthy, stifling individual choice and worth. Deepak Nayyar, in *Democracy, Markets, and People* (2003), confirms:

> [M]arkets exclude people both as consumers and producers or as buyers and sellers if they do not accept, or conform to, the values of a market system. The most obvious example of such exclusion is tribal populations or forest communities in market economies. The same can be said, perhaps, for pockets of pre-capitalist formations in what are essentially capitalist systems. Such exclusion may also take other forms. There may be people who are unable or unwilling to sell their assets or capabilities: for instance, a person may be unable or unwilling to sell an ancestral house in the market. Or, there may be people who are unable or unwilling to sell their capabilities: for instance, a person may be unable or unwilling to charge fees as an astrologer or a musician because of a belief system that such talents cannot and should not be sold. In other words, [P]eople who are excluded because of their set of norms can find some kind of inclusion in the market once they accept a *different set of norms.* In general, the terms of such inclusion are such that it intensif[y] insecurity and exploitation.

Indeed, the unfettered free market *assigns worth* to individuals who either aren't valued by the market, or choose not to conform to its demands. Wealthy individuals, who conform to the market, are deemed the most meritorious in society, while poorer people are perceived as less hard-working and deserving of financial success. The notion that people are superior because

© 2008 National Forensic League

they are better-equipped to compete in the market is dehumanizing. Chuck Barone, in *The Foundations of Classism* (Dept. of Economics, Dickinson College), explains:

> Classist ideology rationalizes class oppression as just and equitable.In the US it is a cultural belief in the ideology of individual achievement, the myth of meritocracy, where anyone can make it if they work hard, that individuals rise on the basis of their own individual effort and ability. Success honors those who make it and failure stigmatizes those who fail. Although cast in terms of individuals and equal opportunities, this ideology is classist. Working class people tend to view themselves and be seen by others as stupid, uneducated and inarticulate, poor leaders, lacking in ability and lazy, crude and uncivilized. But they view those in the middle and owning class as superior and more intelligent, ambitious, with greater poise, self-confidence and leadership.

Viewing one group of citizens as more intrinsically valuable than another undermines the latter's claim to agency. By contrast, affirming encourages wealth redistribution, letting people who can't access or choose not to conform to the market be successful. Thus, I affirm.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Negative Case

"Taxes for the purpose of income redistribution result in a poorer society, both now and later."

Because I agree with economist Robert Higgs, I negate. The value is a just social order, defined as a society that respects the rights that make people human. Since the ability to change their circumstances distinguishes people from objects, they have inherent worth.

The criterion is thus reducing poverty. This criterion fundamentally links to justice because if individuals are worried about where their next meal will come from, they will be unable to exercise their rights and choice-making abilities to their fullest extent.

My thesis is that as there is no morally relevant distinction between individuals, no one group should be systematically and arbitrarily disadvantaged. A free market system offers the best chance of reducing poverty whereas a welfare state reduces upward mobility.

My first contention is that in contrast to wealth redistribution, which stifle growth, free markets naturally improve the standard of living since they attract investors and therefore increase the capital and employment rates within a country. Empirically, this is true of developing nations, where state control of economies scares away potential investors and quell chances of further economic growth. Economic researcher Simon Njoroge confirms[2]:

> The success of economic freedom in bringing forth prosperity holds true for all nations. Comparing three neighboring East African countries tells it all. Two decades of different levels of economic freedom have produced different economic fortunes in these countries. According to the 2007 Human Development Report, Uganda, reported to be East Africa's freest economy by the Heritage rankings, has managed to reduce abject poverty from 56 percent of the population in 1990 to 37.7 percent in 2006. The country has sustained the region's highest annual per capita productivity ($1,478), highest life expectancy (48.4 yrs), and highest education enrollment ratio (66.1 percent). Kenya, second after Uganda in economic freedom, comes second in all measures; her abject-poverty rate rose from a little more than four points (from 48 percent in 1990 to 52.2 percent in 2006). Annual per capita productivity currently stands at $1,140, life expectancy at 47.5 years, and the education enrollment ratio at 60.1 percent. Tanzania, with the least economic freedom of the trio, lags in all measures: its abject-poverty rate rose by 7 points (from 28 percent in 1990 to 35.7 percent in 2006), per capita productivity stands at $674, and life expectancy at 45.9 years. The country has a sorry education enrollment ratio of 47.1 percent. The Ugandan

[2] *Reducing Poverty Through Economic Freedom*. Foundation for Economic Education. June 6, 2008.

© 2008 National Forensic League

example is testament that free people can indeed pull themselves up from poverty. The scale of their economic activities does not matter, as long as they want to improve their lives through the best means they know—whether as subsistence farmers or micro-entrepreneurs.

Considering that 3 billion people worldwide live on less than $2 per day (Poverty Facts and Stats- http://www.globalissues.org/TradeRelated/Facts.asp), society should prioritize the goal that offers the greatest potential for reducing poverty in the long-run

My second contention is that limiting economic inequality at the expense of freedom harms the poor by increasing unemployment. The more people are taxed, the less likely they are to consume goods and participate in market interactions. Subsequently, with this drop in spending, businesses lose money and are forced to lay off workers. Thus, affirming harms the very people it tries to help by reducing employment opportunities. Harvard International Review writer Tian Feng[3] provides a case in point:

> In 1993, the humming Swedish system was tested by troubles that had long been overlooked. The model welfare state could no longer handle the artificial employment rate created by the injection of government jobs into the system, massive government spending, and inflation that governmental policies had not addressed. Simply put, the government was growing too fast to be sustained by the private sector. By 1990, government spending matched 57 percent of the GDP, government jobs accounted for 33 percent of total employment, and annual inflation hit 10 percent. All of these factors led to a spike in unemployment between 1992 and 1993, constituting an implosion in the model welfare state.

By contrast, negating offers more job opportunities since corporations in a free market profit more and therefore can afford to hire more workers. Thus, since only prioritizing the free market over wealth redistribution helps everyone in society, I negate.

[3] *The Dynamic Welfare State*. Harvard International Review. Winter 2008.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 9: Basic Research Methods

Objectives: To familiarize the students with a basic research methodology

Materials: For this lesson, you will need two good articles on the topic (which can be found on the NFL topic briefing bibliography) and two poor articles on the topic (which can be found doing a quick Google search on the topic). You will need excerpts from each article to distribute. It is best to use the first 3 – 5 pages of each article (essentially you need to make sure the excerpt has 4 – 6 paragraphs).

Lesson:

This lesson will vary greatly depending on the resources available to your school district. Many debaters tend to use such internet databases as Lexus Nexus, JSTOR, and Project Muse to do their debate research but these are not generally available to the public. Some sources, the public library, the school library and Google Scholar, are generally available and should be sufficient for starting LDers.

Most students don't have a coherent research process and tend to waste a lot of time sifting through the nearly limitless amount of information out there, quickly getting swamped and giving up. The goal of this lesson is to give the students a model of researching that can reduce this stress and frustration. You will have to adapt this process to the specific resources available to your students. The lesson focuses on Internet research.

Begin by asking the students "what is the purpose of doing research for Lincoln Douglas debate?" They should come to realize that there are two basic purposes: to find background knowledge in order to understand the breadth of the topic and to find specific evidence to use in their cases. Most students seem to focus on the latter rather than the former and this is to their detriment.

Next, ask the students how they generally go about gathering information for papers and projects. Most will say that they generally type the topic into a Google search and essentially hope for the best. Lead the students to understand that the first step in a solid researching process does not begin at the computer but with a discussion that is used to generate initial impressions of the resolution and a brainstorming of key words. Generating an effective list of key words that go beyond the exact wording of the topic is essential for success.

With key words in hand, the next step is to go to the Internet to see what is out there. Ask the student "What is your first goal?" You want to get them to say that their first goal is to find an article that discusses the topic or resolutional conflict in general without being too biased towards either side. Such an article should also (hopefully) have either lots of footnotes or an extensive bibliography. Such an article is known as a "gateway article" as, through this article, they should be able to find other articles about the specifics of the topic. Ask the

© 2008 National Forensic League

students about what the difficulty is in finding such an article. Most will note that they spend so much time reading irrelevant or poorly written articles that they get discouraged.

Tell students that they should break up the research process into several nights. The goal of the first night is to find at least 10 articles that would be good to read. To find these articles they should go to the Internet (using a good database) and follow the process below using the key terms:

1) Look for on-topic titles. Although this seems obvious, many students aren't discerning enough in selecting what to read.
2) Look for articles with abstracts. An abstract is a short summary of the thesis and major points of an article. Many scholarly articles have abstracts. It should be sufficient to read the abstract to see if this article will be useful.
3) If the article doesn't have an abstract or if the abstract seems to suggest that this is a good article, next the student should follow the "First four/Last Four" method. This method says to skim the first four and last four paragraphs of an article. These paragraphs should state the context, thesis, main points and conclusions of the article.
4) Once the student has determined through the above steps that an article is of probable worth, they should save the bibliographical information on a separate word document. I also suggest copying and pasting the link into the word document. If the article is on a database, I would also recommend downloading the article for quicker retrieval. The worst thing a student could do on an initial research night is read entire articles. Students don't feel they have progressed anywhere. It is better for them to have in hand articles they will read so they feel they have made progress.

Once you have established this method of quickly skimming articles, students need to practice these skills. Give each student copies of the first 4 to 5 pages of the articles you prepared. Give the students from 6 to 8 minutes to skim the excerpts of the articles in the manner described above. The time limit is important as the whole point of this exercise to help the student become more efficient in determining the worth of articles they find.

At the end of this time, have the students rank the articles from 1 (most useful) to 4 (least useful). Poll the students to see which article they thought would probably be most useful and which they thought would be less useful. Begin a discussion in which students need to defend their choices. Be sure that when students give their opinions, they explicitly reference the articles. End the discussion when a consensus has been reached. The best article is one that seems to address the central conflict of the resolution without taking a side too overtly and without being overly narrow and one that has lots of footnotes or an extensive bibliography.

Once students understand the process of sifting through articles, they should start reading
the articles they have found. Reading these articles is the goal of the second night of the research process. Here are some strategies to offer students so that they can more quickly skim an article to see if it is worth a truly close reading.

1) Begin by rereading the first and last four paragraphs.
2) Next, read only the topic sentences of the article. Any decent scholar will use topic sentences in their writing so that a student should be able to skim a 20 – 30 page

© 2008 National Forensic League

article in about 5 -10 minutes. Topic sentences should be first sentences of each paragraph. If the topic sentences don't suggest to the students that this article will be helpful, it is not worth reading. If the article seems not to be using topic sentences, then generally the article is not what one should consider a "scholarly" article and is probably poorly written and not worth reading.

3) The magic of CTRL-F, the "find" function: Students can use this function to quickly skim an article to see how often their key words are used throughout the article. If the article is not using them that much, it is an indication that the article may not be that helpful.

Using this method, students should be able to identify 2 or 3 articles to read in their entirety from their list. This is what they should then do on the third night. These articles should then inspire further key words and further searches. It is important for students to realize that the research process should be ongoing and doesn't end until the topic does.

Homework: Students, over the course of three nights, should do the process listed above so that they can practice and see the efficacy of the process.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 10: Basic Structure of a Round

Objective: To have students understand the structure of a Lincoln Douglas round and the purpose of each speech.

Lesson:

This lesson is more of a lecture than any of the other lessons as the information in the lesson is mostly factual and it is of utmost importance that the students have a clear idea of what the flow of what a round looks like. There will be places for student input and discussion throughout. You can ask the students what they think they must do during each speech and what would be strategically sound things to do during each speech.

a) Before the round
Students should have their cases ready before the round. Students should also be pre-flowed. Flowing, the topic of a later lesson, is a method of note taking that allows students to easily keep track of arguments and the responses to those arguments. Pre-flowing means the student has his or her arguments summarized in a specific pattern before the round begins. Lesson 12 will explain how to pre-flow.

b) The Affirmative Constructive – 6 minutes max – also called the AC
In this speech, the student who is affirming will read his or her pre-prepared affirmative constructive. He or she should stand up in front of the room and face the judge. Students should practice reading their speech out loud before going into a round so that they can fill the entire 6 minutes and sound professional.

c) The first Cross Examination – 3 minutes – also called CX
In this time, the negative debater will have 3 minutes to ask the affirmative debater questions. Both debaters should stand up in front of the room next to each other. Although it will seem awkward at first, the debaters should BOTH FACE THE JUDGE and not look at each other during the CX. Although a later lesson will discuss CX in depth, the general idea is that the negative debater can ask question about the content of the affirmative case, whether this is to challenge the affirmative debater's arguments, to clarify the meaning of certain terms or arguments, or to get information they missed during the AC. Additionally, the negative can ask questions to set up the position he or she is about to read. The affirmative should do his or her best to answer these questions honestly.

d) Preparation time – also called Prep Time
During the round, each debater will be given a certain amount of preparation time to use during the round. The amount of prep time may depend upon the tournament although it tends to be four minutes. Debaters should use a portion of their prep time before each of their speeches after the round has begun. Preparation time is used to think of responses to opponent's arguments, decide upon a strategy for the upcoming speech and organize your thoughts going into the next speech. It is suggested that whatever the amount of prep given, debaters reserve at least one minute to use before their final speech.

© 2008 National Forensic League

.

e) The Negative Constructive – 7 minutes – also called the NC
The negative debater will begin this speech by reading a pre-prepared speech. The pre-prepared portion of the speech is generally two to three and a half minutes long. The negative debater then needs to respond to the affirmative arguments. He or she should respond first to the affirmative value structure, comparing and contrasting it with his or her own and then go on to refute the affirmative's contentions. The negative should endeavor to make sure to deal with all portions of the affirmative case. Sometimes negatives will respond to each individual argument and other times negatives will make 'overviews' to the affirmative case position as a whole. Most debaters try to do both. Either way, the negative should endeavor to effectively deal with the affirmative case.

f) The second Cross Examination – 3 minutes
The affirmative debater will have three minutes to question the negative debate. The format is the same as the previous cross examination. The purpose of this cross examination is largely the same as the previous one except that the affirmative debater should attempt to make the next speech as easy as possible. Ways to do this will be presented in the Cross Examination lesson.

g) The First Affirmative Rebuttal – 4 minutes – also known as the 1AR
This speech is sometimes thought of as the most difficult speech in the round. In this speech, the affirmative debater needs to rebuild his or her case by refuting the negative's responses to the case, extending the aff case and attacking the negative case. This is often a lot to do in a short amount of time, so the affirmative debater is going to have to use his or her time efficiently. It is crucial that the affirmative deals with the value and criteria clash if there is a significant difference between the affirmative and negative frameworks. Remember that this part of the case should help the affirmative focus the round and informs judges how they should evaluate the round. Once this has been done, the affirmative then needs to make decisions about what arguments he or she wants to try to advance. Additionally they have to decide which of the negative responses against their case must be responded to as well as deal with the negative case itself. Using overviews, grouping similar arguments, and responding to all of these grouped arguments at once are potential time savers.

h) The Negative Rebuttal – 6 minutes – also known as the NR
This is the final negative speech. In this speech, the negative debater needs to respond to the attacks the affirmative made against the negative case and decide which arguments to advance to convince the judge he or she won the round. Therefore, in this speech, the negative should take time to attempt to resolve the value and value criterion clash so the judge has a clear conception of how to evaluate the round. Once this has been established, the negative needs to make decisions as to which arguments to go for in this speech. Essentially at this point two types of arguments matter: arguments that tell the judge why the negative should win the round (arguments that give a proactive reason to support the negative position) and arguments that explain why the affirmative is losing the round (arguments that point out such important flaws with the affirmative position that they should lose because of them). In this speech, the negative may only respond to arguments he or she responded to in the first speech. The negative should also present "voting issues"

© 2008 National Forensic League

or "issues of crystallization." These are the big arguments which the negative debater thinks he or she is winning that are reasons to vote for the negative. Not every issue should be a voting issue, just those that are important enough to deserve the ballot if the negative is winning them. A more developed idea of voting issues will be presented in a later lesson (Crystallization). The negative may present these voting issues throughout the speech or all together at the end of the speech.

i) The Second Affirmative Rebuttal – 3 min – also known as the 2AR
This is the final affirmative speech. In this speech, the affirmative debater should deal once again with the clash between the value structures and put forward how the affirmative debater believes the round should be evaluated. Once he or she has done this, the affirmative debater need to give voting issues which advance reasons for why he or she is winning the round. The debater should also refute the negative's voting issues. It is critical that the affirmative debater does not make any new arguments in this speech. In other words, if he or she did not talk about an issue in the 1AR, even if it was in the AC, he or she may not talk about it in the 2AR.

Having discussed the flow of a round, students should then see a round in action, which is the focus of the next lesson.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 11: Demonstration Round

Objective: To watch an entire LD round

Materials: The coach should obtain the video of an entire LD round. The National Forensic League has materials available by going to www.nflonline.org and clicking on the "resources" tab, and then clicking the link for "Video/Audio." The NFL Showcase LD Video is also accessible by logging into the Community tab at the top and clicking on video link. Additionally, the final rounds of the NFL National Tournaments are available for purchase at www.nflonline.org . There are also some videos online but some of these are of dubious quality or may be videos of round that would not be accessible to new students. Before showing the video to your students, you should watch the video several times and do the activities below yourself in order to generate appropriate questions to ask your students.

Lesson:

Before beginning the round, tell the students that they should take notes on what both of the speakers are saying and track how they respond to each others' arguments. In the next lesson, they will be taught a more structured way of note taking during the round, known as flowing. Tell the students that you will be showing the video one speech at a time and that you will be stopping the video after each speech in order to have a discussion. This process will most likely take two class periods as an LD round, if run straight through, would take about 40 minutes. The questions offered for each speech are not an exhaustive list. Feel free to add questions and modify questions to suit your needs and the round that your students will be watching.

Show the AC. After the AC, ask the students questions about the AC. Start with the basic information such as the value, value criterion, and tag lines of all of the contentions and sub points. Then ask them about the individual arguments. Ask them what the warrants of a specific argument were and then the impacts and implications the debater draws off of these arguments. If the debater uses author cited evidence (or "cards"), ask students what each piece of analysis said. In doing this, you want to see how much of the information the students are able to take down as well as how well they understand the substantive and tactical purposes of each of the arguments.

Show the first CX. Discuss the types of questions the negative is asking. Are they more to attack something from the AC or presumably to set up something for the NC? Did the debaters agree on anything? If so, what and why? Did the negative get any concessions from the affirmative debater? How did they do that? Do you think the negative asked effective questions? How did the affirmative debater deal with the questions? Were any answers particularly effective? If so, why?

Before showing the NC, ask the students what they think are the most important things the negative must do in this speech in order to win (i.e., which affirmative arguments could potentially devastate to the negative if they are not dealt with?).

© 2008 National Forensic League

Show the NC. After the NC, ask the students about the negative case in the same manner you questioned them about the AC. After reviewing the major structural elements and then going in depth on the specificities of the arguments, begin asking about how the negative responded to the affirmative. Did the negative use any overviews of the affirmative case? If so, what were they about? Did the affirmative contest any of the negative's definitions? If so, how did they do it? Why did they contest the definition? How did the negative deal with the affirmative's value criterion? What and how did the negative respond to the affirmative's arguments? Are there any arguments that the negative dropped, meaning that the negative didn't deal with the argument?

Before showing the 1AR, ask the students to predict what the affirmative debater is going to focus on. Are there any particular issues that they believe the affirmative must deal with in order to win?

Show the 1AR. First, ask the students what the general concept of the affirmative's strategy was. What did the affirmative start with? Why? How did the affirmative deal with the clash of the value structures? How did the affirmative allocate time between dealing with framework issues, responses on their case, extensions of their own case and responding to the negative case? Were there any arguments that the negative missed, or "dropped," that the affirmative capitalized on? Which arguments from the affirmative case did the affirmative decide not to go for? Why do the students think that the affirmative did not go for those arguments? Were there any arguments that the affirmative debater did not cover effectively?

Before showing the NR, at this point in the round, what do your students feel are the most important issues in the round? Ask the students to predict what the negative will focus on in the NR. Are there any issues that the negative must deal with to prevent the affirmative from winning?

Show the NR. As with the 1AR, start by asking the students what they believed to be the general concept of the negative's strategy. Where did the negative debater start? Why do the students believe the negative debater started at that point? Do they think the negative should have started elsewhere? If so, where and why? How did the negative try to resolve the framework debate (meaning the value and value criterion debate)? Did the negative focus more on the affirmative side of the flow or the negative side of the flow? What voting issues did the negative offer? What did the negative do to attempt to preempt the affirmative's offense? Did the negative use any arguments that the affirmative dropped? Did the negative debater do what your students thought they would do? Do they agree with the negative's choices?

Before showing the 2AR, ask your students what they believe the affirmative needs to do to win the round. What arguments does the affirmative absolutely need to deal with? How should the affirmative deal with the negative's voting issues?

Show the 2AR. Where did the affirmative begin? Why? How did the affirmative attempt resolve the framework debate? Was he or she successful? How did the affirmative deal with the negative voting issues? What voting issues did the affirmative offer? What support did the affirmative offer for these voting issues?

© 2008 National Forensic League

Homework:

Have the students decide which student they would vote for if they were the judge. Have them write out a “Reason for Decision” or “RFD” that explains the reason they would vote for that student. The next day, you should poll the students and have a discussion on their various reasons for decision.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 12: Flowing

Objective: To learn how to use the organizational note taking structure known as flowing.

Materials: -The teacher needs to have completed a flow from the sample round. You will need to have watched the round a few times to make sure you have a decent level of detail from the round. Make a photocopy for each student.
- The teacher will need to be able to show segments from the sample round shown in the previous lesson.
- Several short newspaper articles or segments of them (2 – 5 paragraphs worth).
- It would be valuable to have several additional cases (not even necessarily from the resolution you are working on although that is preferable) or even articles to read.

Lesson:

Begin a discussion with the students about how they took notes during the demonstration round. Some specific questions to ask:
- Did the students write out full sentences or did they use shorthand?
- How did the students indicate responses to a given argument? (i.e. How did a student know which responses correlated with which arguments?)
- Did students keep track of arguments that the negative debater and the affirmative debater did not respond to? If so, how?
- How did the student keep track of voting issues/points of crystallization?
- Do the students feel they have a lot of specific details from the round or just the big ideas and the tag lines?
- Ask the students what they believe would be the benefits of having more specific details.

After this discussion, hopefully you will have galvanized the students behind the idea that having a patterned and specific way to take notes during a debate round would be beneficial. To begin, have each student take out (or give them) two blank pieces of paper (I find unlined paper easier to work with, but that is a matter of preference). Have them hold the paper so the long side is vertical. Each student should be told to divide one paper into five roughly equally sized columns by drawing three lines down the paper. The other sheet should have four columns. As students get better with flowing, they will not need to draw these lines, but they are helpful when beginning. On the sheet with five columns, they should head the columns Aff Case (AC), Negative Case (which is the refutation portion of this speech) (NC), 1st Aff Rebuttal (1AR), Negative Rebuttal (NR) and 2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR) from left to right. On the other sheet, head the columns Neg Case (NC), 1st Aff Rebuttal (1AR), Neg Rebuttal (NR), 2nd Aff Rebuttal (2AR). For beginning debaters, it is probably also a good idea to have them label the speech times in each column. At the end of this lesson, there are samples that can photocopied and distributed. Students should be told that, as the columns are not that wide, they should get used to writing fairly small. Many students use two different color pens, one to flow the affirmative arguments and the other to flow the negative arguments.

© 2008 National Forensic League

As students listen to an affirmative case, they should write their notes in the left hand column. Tell the students that they want to make sure to write in a type of shorthand. They should develop symbols and abbreviations to represent common things in debate rounds. For example, to label the value, use "V"; to label the value criterion, use "VC"; rather than write the word "Justice" (which comes up in a LOT of debate rounds), you can write a J with a circle around it. Each resolution will have specialized common vocabulary for which your students can develop abbreviations (e.g. a recent resolution was about the separation of church and state which many people abbreviated as SCS). To indicate "not," many people use a circle with a slash through it. Math symbols are also very useful such as > to indicate one thing is better than another or ≠ to show two things are not the same thing. Each student will have to build their own lexicon of shorthand, although as the students are learning, it might be effective for them to develop a common 'vocabulary' of shorthand so that they can read each other's flows.

It is important that students indicate the structure of the cases that they are heading. If the reader of the case labels an argument in a specific way with a "tag line," meaning a short phrase that summarizes the argument, the student should write that down. If the reader of the case enumerates certain points, the student should write down this same enumeration (e.g. If the reader says "There are three reasons why this is true, first…" It is vital that the student gets all parts and knows how to refer to them as they reader does). If the reader uses subpoints, it is important to label these the same way the reader does. If the reader has evidence in his or her case and cites the author (which he or she should) it is important to write down the name of the author by the information/argumentation that is credited to that author. The case will/should note what the "impacts" or implications of the arguments are. These should be noted specifically as impacts rather than independent arguments. As students are writing, they should also leave space between arguments so that their flow does not get too crowded. The spaces should be left to separate distinct arguments. Additionally, if students miss an argument, it is vital that they leave space to write that argument down later (as they will get a chance to ask what that argument was in CX…if they don't leave the space, they might not realize they missed it). In order to maximize the space students have, inform them that they can flip the paper and continue to column down the other side of the paper. This process takes a lot of practice in order to take in material quickly, digest it and write down a few notes that are coherent while getting specific details.

Once students believe they have the general idea, it is time to give the process a try. Have the students take out a separate sheet of paper and make one column down the left side so they can flow the article as if it were an AC. Read the article at a moderate pace and ask them to flow the article. After you are finished reading, ask the students about details from the article to see how much they were able to get on their flow. Ask the students about what shorthand notations they used. Try this again with a slightly longer article read at a slightly faster rate. Repeat the questioning to track how much detail they students were able to get down.

Once the students feel comfortable with this process, it is time to try this with a debate round. Play the AC from the demonstration round they watched the previous day (remember this can be watched or ordered from the National Forensic League at www.nflonline.org as was explained in the previous lesson) and ask the students to flow the AC on the sheet they prepared. Afterwards, ask students about specific shorthand notations they used. Then ask

© 2008 National Forensic League

them about details from the case to see how much information the students were able to write down. When asking these questions, it is best to ask about information "going down the case" or in order of how it was read. Be sure to ask both about the tag lines of specific arguments as well as what the specifics within the arguments were. It also is a good idea to go around the room to look at their flows to see if they are messy, cramped or too sparse. You can tell a lot about the flow from a quick glance at it.

After this, play the NC from the demonstration round but stop the video before the negative debater begins rebutting the affirmative case. Once again question the students to see how much they were able to write down while walking around to look at their flows. After this process, remind the students that the negative debater is about to begin answering the affirmative case. Ask the students about how they think they will flow the rebuttal portion of the NC (which is sometimes called the first negative rebuttal). You are looking for the students to say: - responses to a given argument should be written next to the argument to which it responds

- if the negative debater "groups" an argument, that means they are responding to a section of argumentation with one response. To flow this, draw a bracket to show what the grouping is to an arrow for the response to this grouping.
- if the negative debater enumerates arguments, the enumeration should be recorded
- if the negative debater does not respond to a specific argument, it is important to leave space next to this argument.

After this discussion, play the remainder of the NC and ask the students to flow the responses. Once again, quiz the students about what they were able to get down. Be sure to also ask them which arguments the negative missed entirely or "under-covered," meaning insufficiently responded to.

Before playing the 1AR, ask the students to pay specific attention to the arguments that the affirmative chooses to advance or "extend" in this speech as well as which arguments the affirmative says were dropped. To introduce a new notation, if the affirmative says to extend an argument, you would draw a horizontal arrow from the part of the argument that initially referenced this into the 1AR column and write down the implication the affirmative draws from this. Note that the affirmative should only be extending the argument if they beat back the negative arguments against their argument. If the affirmative is extending a "dropped" argument, often people draw the horizontal arrow and put a circle on it in the 1NR column to indicate the negative made no response to this in their first speech. Finally, note to the students that they will be writing on both pieces of paper depending on what argument the affirmative debater is responding to, which could be the affirmative debater responding to the negative case on "the neg side of the flow" or responding to a response the negative made against their case on "the aff side of the flow." Once students feel they understand these ideas, play the 1AR and have the students flow it. Afterward, quiz the students about what they were able to get down. Ask them specifically about which arguments the affirmative extended and HOW they extended them (meaning what did they specifically say to advance the arguments) as well as which arguments they claimed were dropped by the negative debater.

Before playing the negative rebuttal (NR), remind the students that the negative will be doing many of the same things the affirmative just did such as responding to the affirmative attacks and extending their arguments. Additionally, the negative will be giving "voting issues"

© 2008 National Forensic League

or "points of crystallization," which are the reasons that the negative feels the judge should vote for him or her. To indicate voting issues, students can box and number issues or arguments that are labeled by as such by the debater. Play the NR and have the students flow it. Once again, question the students about specific elements, especially the voting issues and the information that is brought together to create the voting issues.

Finally, play the second affirmative rebuttal (2AR) and have the students flow it. As before, ask questions to see how much detail they were able to get. After this, hand out the flow that you created and ask the students to compare and contrast their flow to the sample flow. It is important to remind the students not to get disheartened if they don't have nearly as much information as you do as they are just learning.

Once this skill has been introduced, it is of vital importance that the skill is practiced as much as possible. It is easy enough to start the next few classes by reading a sample case and then collecting the students' flows in order to make comments on them in terms of the neatness of the flow, the level of detail and the organizational structure. Flows could also be collected and graded as well. Additionally, you can ask the students questions as during the above activity if you don't want to collect the material. A flowing drill only takes 8 minutes for an AC and 4 or 5 minutes for an NC if you factor in a minute to set up and a minute to collect the material.

As a final flowing skill, when going into a round, students should have their own case "pre-flowed." If they are affirming, they should have the AC column filled out with all of the information from their case. The reason for this is so when the negative is responding to the affirmative case, the affirmative debater can write the negative's responses down next to the corresponding arguments. A well thought out pre-flow can also be used to see which arguments your opponent is missing or mishandling as well as to help in the next speech. Students, eventually, should begin to type up their pre-flows using the rhetoric from their cases and the wording by which they intend to extend each piece of analysis.

A copy of a sample pre-flow is at the end of this lesson. Note that this pre-flow is 2 pages long as it is meant to be printed on the front and back side of the same sheet of paper. This is a pre-flow for an affirmative case on the resolution "Resolved: The actions of corporations ought to be held to the same moral standards as the actions of individuals." Notice:

1) Words the student defined, names of authors of evidence and tag lines to contentions and subpoints are in bold
2) The student has typed out what he or she would say if he/she were able to extend or advance that argument
3) The student spaced arguments nicely so there is room to flow responses
4) The student has noted, with !!!!!!!!!, the important impacts to his arguments that s/he needs to extend should s/he be winning these arguments. Notice that each implication specifically cites the evaluative mechanism for the round (the burden of justifying a moral exemption)

This pre-flow not only helped the student appear more prepared at the start of the round to the judge, but also functioned to help him execute his strategy in the round since it clearly

© 2008 National Forensic League

shows which arguments are important. This is the pre-flow from a very advanced debater and is not the expectation for a novice, but something to work towards.

© 2008 National Forensic League

AC (3 min)	NC (7 min)	1AR (4 min)	NR (6 min)	2AR (3min)

© 2008 National Forensic League

NC (7 min)	1AR (4 min)	NR (6 min)	2AR (3 min)

© 2008 National Forensic League

<u>Aff V1 (Moral Good)</u>

Corp: assoc of indivs, contin exist,
pwrs/lblties indep of members

French: A corporation acts when employees act according to its internal decision structure
-Corps only act when individuals inside act.
-Focusing on the corporation as a distinct, collective entity ignores the phrase "the actions of" and thus fails to account for the totality of the resolution.

Hold=to regard in a certain way
-Actions can only be regarded in a certain way, not made accountable, so alternate interpretations of hold ignore the phrase "the actions of" and fail to account for the totality of the resolution.

[logic supersedes concerns abt ground division – all we have prior to the round is the text of the resolution, and this predictability is key to having any advocacy. My interp is the only logical possibility, and thus predictable]

Luban: Common morality is the baseline against which initially judge actions regardless of social role. We have a common morality because – at our simplest level – we are free and equal moral agents.

Luban: To cut and maim a person is wrong, but the fact that a surgeon cuts you open is acceptable. So, morality accounts for roles.
!!!!!Neg has the **burden** to justify an exemption from common morality. Otherwise, you affirm because employees are held to common standards because they are still moral persons.

arbitrarily exempting an indiv from common morality would be:
a) **undesirable**, since it would denigrate the worth of other humans
b) **illogical**, since = moral worth logically implies = moral judgment

To justify a moral exemption:

1) The social institution that creates the role must serve an inherent moral good

2) It must be absolutely necessary for the role agent to sever from common morality to achieve this good.

© 2008 National Forensic League

(1) shows that the violation of common morality is outweighed by a greater moral good
(2) imposes a necessity requirement, preventing role agents from abusing their exempt status.

1) Corporations do not serve an inherent moral good.

a) Corps aren't morally good from a deontological perspective b/c they prioritize profit over the need to respect side constraints

b) Corps aren't morally good from a consequentialist perspective b/c they benefit an exclusive group of shareholders, not any social good.

Litowitz: There is no need to demonstrate social utility to receive a corporate charter.

!!!!!Corps aren't morally justified institutions, so the first burden isn't met and corporate actors ought to held to common moral standards.

-ancillary benefits from corporations are too speculative to justify a general moral exemption for corporate action

2) It is not necessary for corporate employees to sever from common morality in order to generate profit.

-Immoral corporate action like pollution and child labor might advance the goals of the corporation, but such actions aren't necessary for profitability.

Dunfee: Corporations aren't expected to hire a hitman to kill off the competition nor to give away all their money to charity.

!!!!!Corporations can pursue profit within moral bounds, so a role-based moral exemption for corporate action is unnecessary.

Dunfee: Exxon's failure to respond to the moral desires in the market cost shareholders.

!!!!!Moral exemptions for corporations actually oppose the corporation's goal of profit.

!!!!!Employees don't need to behave immorally to fulfill the corporation's purpose, so the second burden isn't met and corporate actors ought to be held to common moral standards.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 13: Crystallization

Objective: To understand the format and use of voting issues ("points of crystallization" or "voters").

Lesson:

Ask the students what they believe to be the purpose of crystallization in the round. Lead them to the fact that a good crystallization should

- explain the decision calculus (i.e. method of evaluation) the judge should use to decide the round
- explain to the judge why they are winning offensive arguments that link to the decision calculus forwarded.

While crystallization is always (or should be) done in the final speeches for each debater, there are differences in how different debaters allocate time to crystallization. Some negative debaters will discuss the decision calculus the judge should use at the beginning of the NR, deal with issues on the flow and then give voting issues at the end of the NR. Other negative debaters will "crystallize down the flow," meaning that they will give voting issues as they finish discussing that issue on the flow rather than waiting to the end of the speech. Some affirmative debaters will spend the entire 2AR doing crystallization. Others will discuss specific issues on the flow before giving voting issues at the end of the 2AR. There is no 'right' way to do this although different students and judges may have preferences.

Have the students recall the voting issues from the demonstration round they watched and flowed. Ask them which voters they found compelling and why they were compelling. Hopefully they will identify the voting issues that were well structured, referenced specific places on the flow that the student was winning issues, directly compared affirmative and negative arguments ("weighed the arguments") and explained the reason why this issue linked to the established value criterion for the round.

In a mini-lecture, explain to the students that a good crystallization is based primarily in two ideas: 1) understanding and/or winning the value/value criterion clash in the round so that they are framing their arguments using the same evaluative mechanism the judge will use to evaluate the round and 2) selecting the most powerful issues that matter with respect to that evaluative mechanism. Most students will understand the first point well before they understand the second. At the end of a debate round, there are often a plethora of issues being advanced by both debaters but some are truly irrelevant. Students must work and practice to become adept at issue selection so that they are picking the correct issues to label as voting issues.

So, what makes a good voting issue? This question can be phrased with respect to the substance of the voting issue and then again with respect to the structure of the voting issue. Substantively, a good voting issue is an OFFENSIVE reason to vote FOR the debater with respect to the standard (i.e. value criterion) for the round. Therefore, to have a good voting issue, the student must first spend time during (preferably at the beginning of) their last speech clarifying the standards debate. Understanding what the standard is will help students filter their arguments to select only those arguments that meet the standard or arguments that prevent their opponents from meeting the standard. Therefore, students who understand crystallization

© 2008 National Forensic League

will realize that even though it tends to be done at the end of the last speeches, the entire speech must prepare for the crystallization if it is to be effective.

Once the standards debate has been clarified, it becomes easier to see what issues will matter in the round. For example, if the standard is "ends based," meaning having to do with the outcomes of actions, such as a value criterion of "protection of life" would be, only those arguments that prove that your side is protecting life and that your opponent's side leads to the destruction of or indifference to life should matter in the round. As another example, if the standard is a means based, meaning concerned with the procedures by which actions take place, such as "ensuring meaningful checks on government action," only arguments that show your side places more checks on the government (or more effective checks) would be important. As students prepare for this last speech, they should find the arguments that strongly link to the standard for the round but also find the irrelevant arguments. All too often, students will not identify to the judge that the arguments that their opponent may be winning are irrelevant as they have no connection to the standard (such as an ends based argument when the standard is means based or vice/versa). Additionally, students should see voting issues as larger issues in the round and not small isolated arguments. Voting issues become more relevant as they show how the arguments interact with each other and cover more ground.

Once a student has chosen which issues to make their voting issues, they should then structure them appropriately. Often students will find it difficult to properly structure their voting issues in the heat of a round and will merely label individual arguments they are winning as voters thereby weakening the impact of their arguments. Students should be presented with this structure and encouraged to use it as best as possible.

The voting issue should begin with some short label that tags the issue that the student is asking the judge to vote on. Next the student should identify the offense s/he is winning and has advanced (with specific signposting to some place on the flow). S/he should then identify why the opponent is not winning this issue. This can be done by citing places (specifically signposting) on the flow where the student is beating his/her opponent's responses about this issue or by showing how the student's arguments are more important the opponent's arguments on the same topic. The latter is, as discussed previously, called weighing. Finally, the student should explain why this issue links to the value criterion and is sufficient for him/her to win the round. Notice, this structure explains why the student is winning the round due to this issue (offense), why the opponent can't win the round on this issue (defense) and why this issue is relevant to winning the round.

As an example, a typical voting issue might sound like this: "My first voting issue is (insert shorthand name for the issue). I am winning this argument through the extension of the second subpoint of my first contention that states (summarize the argument). My opponent makes this issue worse as I stated when I responded to their first contention by saying (summarize the argument). Although my opponent may believe s/he is winning the second contention, my argument outweighs because (insert a comparison of the arguments). This is sufficient to meet the criterion of (insert criterion) because (insert reason)."

To practice constructing voting issues, there are a few exercises that students can do.

© 2008 National Forensic League

1) Students can use their flows from the demonstration round and try to fix the underdeveloped voting issues they saw in the format suggested.
2) Presuming the students have cases by this point, have them write out 2 to 3 voting issues for their cases. Obviously these cannot reference what their opponents did wrong but these should concisely and cleanly explain several reasons why their position is worthy of the ballot. Make sure the students are not saying, "my first contention is my first voting issue." Judges find this both vague and annoying. These should each be about 30 – 45 seconds. If they are longer than that, the student has not been concise enough.
3) Once students have done practice rounds, they can redo the voting issues from these rounds until they can deliver them efficiently and persuasively.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Lesson 14: Cross Examination

Objective: To learn how to effectively use cross examination (CX).

Lesson:

This lesson functions more as a lecture with some classroom discussion. Once the lecture has been given, there are a few cross examination exercises that can be practiced with your students. Begin by asking the students what they believe to be the purposes of cross examination. Lead the students to the following answers:

- To ask clarification questions about
  - arguments that the student missed
  - arguments the student didn't understand
  - the exact meaning of definitions presented
  - the tactical implications of arguments in the case
- To attack the opponent's case position
  - To question the veracity of claims made
  - To question the logical links between the arguments
- To establish a presence within the round
- to set up the negative case s/he is about to read

When doing cross examination, it is important that the students present themselves in a specific manner. Students need to look at the judge and not at each other. They need to stand still and stand upright. It is important that they remain calm and collected at all points. It is important that these are stated outright. During any CX practice, students should be immediately reminded if they do not present themselves correctly. Bad habits are easy to set in stone and difficult to correct, so it is best to solve the problems before they start.

There are two general genres of CX skills to master, cross examining opponents and dealing with being cross examined. Although there is an overlap in terms of the skills, there are some specific issues that need to be considered and tactics that can be employed.

a) When crossing an opponent:

- Start with OFFENSE! As the negative debater, students' first chance to speak in the round is the first cross examination question. They shouldn't waste the opportunity by asking a clarification question which can send the message that the student did not pay attention. In order to do this, students can pre-prepare a few questions that affirmative debaters tend to not answer in their cases. Leading with one of these sends a good message. Alternately, students can ask their opponent what the central thesis of his/her case is. It is amazing how this question rattles students as they have trouble concisely giving the big idea of their case.
- Have a plan! Students should have several objectives going into CX whether this is to obtain specific concessions, to nail down the opponent to a specific meaning of a certain term or to highlight the fallacious nature of a specific argument. The more specific the objectives, the more successful the CX tends to be.

© 2008 National Forensic League

- Favor shorter questions that all build on each other rather than one long ponderous question (which tends to get confusing)
- When asking clarification questions, students should never say "I didn't get the tag line of the second contention." They should instead ask, "Can you tell me the exact tag line of your second contention and explain how this contention fulfills your criterion?" Notice here the student will not only get the clarification they seek but also how this contention links to the criterion which will help the student understand the function of this argument in the round. The tactic here is linking clarification questions with questions about the implications of that argument. Rather than asking "What is your value criterion?" students should ask "What is the exact text of your value criterion and how does it help us measure the value?"
- Pick an argument and just ask variations on "why?"
- If the opponent has something confusing in his/her case, students can ask him/her to read sections of the case aloud to clarify.
- If students agree with elements of their opponent's framework (such as definitions or the value criterion), they can come to agreement with their opponent in CX so that there are less things that have to be contested/discussed in the next speech.
- Be careful not to ask totally open ended questions.
- When flowing the opponent's case, a student should have a third color pen handy. When the student hears something they think they want to ask a question about or miss something, they can circle the argument or the blank space where they need to fill in an argument. This way, the student will be less likely to forget to ask that question.

b) When being cross examined:

- The most important thing is to remain calm and composed no matter what students' opponents are doing.
- The second most important thing is to know the case backwards and forwards. When the opponent asks questions, a student wants to try to stick to the text of his/her position. S/he should convey the idea that the concern that brought up has already been answered in the position.
-Students should answer questions directly without rambling. Most people who make concessions do so when they talk too long without thinking about what they are saying.
- Students should not be afraid to take a moment to consider their answer before responding.
- Most yes or no questions that debaters ask are not really yes or no questions. students shouldn't t let an opponent force them into a situation where them cannot clarify what they mean. If opponents insist you answer "yes or no," let them know that the question they are asking really isn't a yes or no question and that you would be glad to explain why your answer needs to be more nuanced than "yes or no." On the flip side, if you are asked a simple "yes or no" question that can be answered, answer it.

© 2008 National Forensic League

- Be careful if your opponent tries to trap you in a hypothetical situation or makes an analogy. Be sure that the situation is actually analogous before you answer the questions. If the situation isn't analogous, explain to your opponent why it isn't analogous.
- Finally, remember, be calm and composed.

There are a few exercises that you can do with your students to practice CX:

1) Have one student read a case. Have the entire class CX this one student. Each student is allowed one primary question and one follow up question. This forces the student whose case it is to deal with a lot of different types of questions in a short time. It also forces the questioners to be clear and direct in their questioning.
2) Have one student read a case. Tell the remaining students that they will be able to ask up to five questions in order to gain a specific concession. Give the class 2 minutes to prepare. Have the student who read the case stand with their back to the blackboard. Call another student up to the front. Have them write the concession they want to obtain on the board so the entire class except for the student who read the case can see it. Let the student ask their five questions. It is important to remind the student who is being cross examined that s/he shouldn't be deliberately obstructionist. You can do this exercise about 4 or 5 times with a given case before it gets difficult to find additional unique concessions. This can be repeated with another case. Before you move on to another case, have a class discussion about which tactics worked and which didn't work.

© 2008 National Forensic League

Final Thoughts:

From this point your students should have all the skills needed to debate, but now students need to practice these skills in context of the current resolution with practice debates. Future lessons should look at delivery/presentation skills, judge adaptation, dealing with different opponent types, appropriate tournament preparation such as pre-flowing, preparing responses, acquiring additional evidence, what to expect at a tournament and how to revise arguments and case structures as you test initial ideas.

© 2008 National Forensic League