Arguing About Values

An Introduction to Lincoln-Douglas Debate

by Martin "Randy" Cox and Matthew Whitley

Contents

LD Format

Origin:

Lincoln-Douglas debate is modelled after the one-on-one debates made famous by Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas in the middle of the 19th century. During this series of debates, the two candidates for the U.S. Senate toured to several locations in Illinois, presenting their views on the major voting issues and persuading the audience to vote for them. Douglas won that election, but history would prove, of course, to remember Lincoln.

Up until LD became a national event, students interested in debate could enter two forms of competitive debate: policy and parliamentary. Policy debate is a teammed event, usually with two students.

LD became especially popular in the late 1970's/early 80's as an alternative to policy debate. LD was intended to be an event dedicated to persuasive speaking, logic, rational thought and philosophical argumentation that even a layman could understand in a single setting; its aim is to produce articulate, intellectual and logical people who can apply a variety of philosophical methods and value systems to controversial issues.

Basics:

-LD revolves around the interaction and conflict among values and value systems.

-LD involves two participants who debate a resolution of value; the affirmative speaker attempts to prove a resolution true using a variety of persuasive techniques and arguments whereas the negative speaker attempts to prove the resolution false.

-**Both** sides are expected to present cases supporting their respective positions as well as clash with and refute the cases of the opposite side (Rule #1: the most sacred word in LD is CLASH!!!)

-Unlike some other forms of debate, LD demands that both speakers carry an equal burden of proof and refutation.

-LDers must prepare adequately for both sides of the resolution (Sure, you can try to go to a tournament with an awesome negative and an affirmative case you wrote the night before, but a 2-2 record won't break at most tournaments- that leads us to Rule #2: Be Prepared!)

-The times are as follows:

> Affirmative Constructive- 6 minutes
> Negative Cross Examination of Affirmative- 3 minutes
> Negative Constructive- 7 minutes
> Affirmative Cross Examination of Negative- 3 minutes
> First Affirmative Rebuttal- 4 minutes
> Negative Rebuttal- 6 minutes
> Second Affirmative Rebuttal- 3 minutes

Throughout the debate, each speaker will have a specified amount of preparation time, usually 3 minutes.

Words of Wisdom for Successful Debating

1) LD is a game; you might even think of it as a sport of the mind. Since it is a "sport," you should approach it as if it were an activity, not the end of mankind as we know it. Win or lose, your life will continue. Use this event to sharpen your critical thinking skills, improve your speaking style, meet new people and have fun. If you enter this activity with a "win at any cost" attitude, then you will only hurt yourself and alienate others.

2) Due to the nature of this event, debate lends itself to conflict between speakers. **NO MATTER WHAT HAPPENS**, always control your personal feelings and remain courteous to your opponent, the audience, and the judge. No one likes rudeness or a shouting match, especially the judge!

3) LD is a demanding activity. I guarantee you that the harder you work on your own the better you will do and the more fun you will have with this activity.

4) One of the best parts about LD is the number of amazing people who you will meet. There is nothing wrong with being competitive, but keep debate rivalries and personal feelings separate. You'd be surprised how easily your fiercest opponent can become your best friend.

5) You will win some rounds and lose some rounds; you must learn to handle both situations. An arrogant winner is just as bad as a poor loser.

6) Always follow tournament ethics; if you have to cheat to win, then you've missed the point about the resolution.

7) **You** are the best judge of your own performance; regardless of the results on the ballot, you will know if you did the best you could do. If you did, the be proud of yourself even if you lost to an excellent opponent. If you win a round but know that you only gave a partial effort, then make sure you concentrate in future rounds.

8) If you approach it correctly, this activity will provide memories, skills, and relationships which will last a lifetime (guess where Mr. Cox met his fiancee!) When all is said and done, trophies rust and are forgotten, but your memories will last a lifetime. I hope all of you reach your potential and are successful and tournaments, but for the next two weeks and the rest of your competitive experience I wish two things more than any other: make as many friends as possible and **HAVE FUN!!!**

Tournament Etiquette

Perhaps the one aspect of Lincoln-Douglas Debate and speech competition in general which is neglected the most is tournament behavior. Ethical standards and morality are often the subject of discussion in LD rounds; ironically, many students (and coaches) violate these very standards in the competitive atmosphere of a tournament. The following guidelines will help students to know not only which behaviors are acceptable at tournaments from a legal standpoint, but also which actions and attitudes will make the LD experience more enjoyable to all involved.

-The most sacred word in tournament etiquette is professionalism. Professionalism is a state of mind where a competitor dedicates him/herself to maintaining composure, courtesy, friendliness and a sense of fairness at all times.

-Students should at **no** time participate in any of the following activities: stealing evidence from other competitors, lobbying against particular schools, sharing information about other people's cases, or in any other manner deliberately sabotaging another individual or team's chances.

-Students who do not advance are commonly requested by their coaches to watch and/or flow out rounds. This process is perfectly acceptable as a learning tool, but students should never take flows out of the room or reveal the information to other students while a tournament is in progress.

-Fabricating evidence is grounds for immediate disqualification from a tournament. To protect themselves, debaters should bring photocopies of all evidence which they might utilize in a round. If one suspects or can prove that false evidence is being used, then the argument and proof may be presented **courteously** to the judge in the round. If proof is discovered after a round is over, then a contestant should provide the information and proof to his/her coach who should then file a protest with the tournament director. **DON'T LAUNCH A PROTEST UNLESS YOU CAN PROVE IT.**

-Students should never talk negatively about other students. Professionalism dictates that all competitors deserve equal respect regardless of talent level. Should you choose to ignore that rule, remember that should someone overhear you (usually that someone will be your judge in the next round) then you will develop a bad reputation. Bad reputations don't help establish credibility and persuasiveness.

-When postings go up, people who scream are just as annoying as people who kick the wall in disgust. If you did break, there is probably someone next to you who did not who may be hurt by your victory celebration. When postings go up, calmly accept congratulations and go to the round or congratulate those who break and go watch and support other teammates. While at awards assemblies, whether you win or lose congratulate the other contestants and provide a courteous smile, handshake or hug (This is about having fun, not holding grudges!)

-When in doubt, consult the constitution of your speech association to see if an action is legal. Always use common sense; if an action would undermine the integrity of the event or harm another person, don't do it!!!

If you follow these basic rules, you will have much more fun and provide an atmosphere for teaching. Remember, this event is not about trophies, it is about learning. All students and coaches need to address it that way!

Resolutional Analysis

Resolutions establish the parameters and subject area for Lincoln-Douglas debates. Keep in mind that LD resolutions are **propositions** or **premises of value**- this means that the resolution demands that debaters weigh the value of one or more ideas, institutions, or beliefs. Regardless of the actual wording of the resolution, all premises of value fulfill three objectives:

1) **they establish the general topic area**- The topic area involves the issues debaters must address. The topic area can be very specific (i.e. the resolution "that capital punishment is immoral" is limited solely to capital punishment) or it can be broad and open to interpretation (i.e. with the resolution "the collective good is more important than individual autonomy" one must discuss both collective good and individual autonomy, but the focus of the debate will depend on what the individual debaters do.

2) **they create the parameters of the debate**- The resolution identifies what should be the main clash and subject area discussed by the debaters. The resolution will establish what each debater must try to prove (i.e. With "Resolved: Randy's philosophy lectures are less interesting than reruns of 'Saved By the Bell,'" the Affirmative cannot win by proving Randy needs a haircut- that may be true, but it is outside the parameters of the debate.)

3) **they mandate the burden of proof**- The resolution implies what each debater must do to win. (i.e. With "Resolved: the possession of nuclear weapons is moral, the Aff wins if he/she proves possession is moral, and the Neg wins if he/she proves possession is not moral.) Once you identify the burden of proof for each side, you will know how to focus your case.

Types of Resolutions

When you receive a new resolution, you immediately need to identify what type of resolution it is, for each type of resolution implies a different burden on the Aff and Neg. There are five basic types of resolutions used by NFL:

1) Comparative- This resolution compares two values or entities and states one is more valuable that the other (i.e. When in conflict, the spirit of the law should be valued above the letter of the law). With these resolutions, the Aff must prove X is better than Y whereas the Neg must argue X is not better than Y, which is not necessarily that Y is better than X.

2) Definitive- This resolution places a value upon an action, and the resolution usually sounds like a statement of fact (i.e. Abortion is moral, Gun control is justified, Universal health care is desirable). With a definitive resolution the Aff must demonstrate that X (the object of evaluation) =Y (the evaluative term), while the Neg must show that X does not equal Y.

3) Superlative- This topic states that something is more important (or less important) than everything else (i.e. justice ought to be considered the highest value; democracy is the most effective form of government). The Aff must show that the object of evaluation is paramount, usually from a broad based perspective, but the Neg must attempt to either discredit the object or present a higher value.

4) Idealistic- This resolution describes the way things should be, as opposed to the way things are (i.e. The liberal arts should receive more emphasis in secondary school). This topic is the closest LD resolution to CX, for the Aff must argue what we should value, while the Neg can either support the status quo or reject what the Aff says we should value.

5) Pro/Con- This simply says the advantages of something outweigh the disadvantages (i.e. the benefits of gun control justify limits on individual freedom; the advantages of teenage drinking laws outweigh the disadvantages.) For this topic both the Aff and Neg must describe the advantages/disadvantages and explain why they should/should not be valued.

Elements of a Resolution

Obviously, the first step in addressing any new resolution is to break down the major terminology in the proposition. There are three terms you should become familiar with as soon as possible:

1) Object(s) of evaluation- these are the major concepts, entities, actions, or values being measured by the resolution. (i.e. in "Resolved: that competition is superior to cooperation as a means of achieving academic excellence, **competition** and **cooperation** are the actions which are being weighed against each other.)

2) Evaluative term- this word or phrase establishes the conflict, judgment, or interpretation of the object(s) of evaluation. In the above resolution, the word **superior** is the evaluative term. In the case of Resolved: that corporal punishment is just, **just** is the evaluative term. This term is critical because it also highlights what should be the focus of both the Affirmative and Negative case.

3) Context- this phrase creates any boundaries which may be on the topic (**NOTE: some resolutions have no context!!!)** For instance, in our competition/cooperation topic, **means of achieving academic excellence** is the context; the Aff should not to support competition in sports, foreign policy, television ratings, or anything else- just academic excellence. Meanwhile the topic "Resolved: Killing a human is immoral" has no context (and sucks as a topic), so you could discuss anything from war to self-defense to murder to euthanasia (although if the topic read killing a human in self-defense is immoral the phrase "in self-defense" would become the context).

Sample Resolutions (Identify the object(s) of evaluation, the evaluative term, and the context)

Resolved:

Affirmative-action policies in the United States are justified.

When in conflict, the rights of the accused ought to be valued above a free press.

Education ought to be considered a privilege, not a right.

When in conflict, cultural unity ought to be valued above cultural diversity.

Burning the U.S. flag is antithetical to traditional American values.

The U.S. government ought not to pass 'moral legislation.'

A broad liberal arts training is the best form of education.

The health benefits of banning public smoking outweigh the economic impacts on tobacco farmers.

Owning a home ought to be a right, not a luxury.

Adapted from Kringel/Foral, 1993 and Adair, 1993

Definitions

How to use definitions in Affirmative and Negative cases:

Definitions should not be the focus of a debate round, but far too often a round degenerates into a "my definition of justice is better than your definition of justice, thus I win every contention." Definitions are a tool to be used to set the boundaries of the debate- They should **NOT** be manipulated so as to give your side an edge over the other. Some general tips for selecting definitions are:

1) Use mainstream, accepted sources for your definitions. Do not try to be cute by convincing some history professor to state an impressive definition which says only the Affirmative can win! Some good sources are:

> *-Black's Law Dictionary*
> *-Dictionary of the Social Sciences*
> *-Dictionary of Philosophy*
> *-Encyclopedia of Philosophy*
> *-Dictionary of the History of Ideas*
> *-Oxford English Dictionary*
> *-Corpus Juris Secundum*

2) Give the most basic, everyday, accepted definition for each term. Definitions are merely supposed to provide a clear understanding of what each term means; this is not the time for you to play games by trying to twist definitions.

3) DEFINE EVERY MAJOR TERM!!! Do not ignore major words such as "just," "conflict," "superior," etc. Conversely, do not define every single word- all you accomplish by defining "the United States" is wasting about 20 seconds and annoying the judge.

4) Make sure major phrases such as "affirmative action," "gun control," or "secondary education" are defined together- do not define "affirmative" and then "action" for you lose the context.

5) If you make your definitions as clear and neutral as possible, then the debate can move on to the issues where it should be focused anyway.

Challenging Definitions

On either side you may be forced to challenge your opponent's definitions because they are both biased and critical to his/her case. DO NOT offer counter-definitions unless (a) your opponent's definition is invalid for some reason and (b) you are willing to explain why your definition is better. Do not offer counter-definitions that are the same as the original definition. Do not offer a counter-definition and move on without explaining why your definition is superior. Here are some guidelines for when to attack definitions:

> -when they are too narrow or are obscure
> -when they come from biased or subjective sources
> -when they are out of context; definitions must always fit the intent of the resolution
> -out of date (This implies definitions from 1889, not 1989)
> -phrases such as affirmative action defined in single words
> -anything which does not provide a neutral foundation for the debate

Evidence

Debaters must always remember that all arguments, no matter how eloquently worded, are little more than assumptions without *evidence*. While LD debate is primarily a debate of ethics and values, tangible evidence is critical to establishing the justification for certain points of view. Therefore, the successful debater must master the arts of using and refuting evidence.

Nature of Evidence

If evidence is used correctly, the evidence *itself* should not be a point of contention. (Example: If you cite an article from the June 14, 1996 issue of the *New York Times* which states that the federal government will send $60.5 billion in military aid to Israel, that fact should *not* be debatable. What is debatable is whether or not this fact proves that a given argument is true.)

Evidence comes in two general forms: (1) fact and (2) opinion of fact.

Factual evidence consists of things people believe to be true either because they have experienced them directly or because they regard them as the truthfully recorded experiences of others. Some examples include reports, narratives, statistics, and historical descriptions.

Opinion-based evidence is far more controversial, for it generally supplies someone's personal beliefs, which could be quite different from another individual's. Example's include John Rawls' advocacy of distributive justice or a *Newsweek* article speculating who will win the presidency. Opinion-based evidence is not less valid than factual evidence, but the debater must justify the use of opinion-based evidence with a logical argument.

Evidence Tests

There are numerous ways by which one can raise doubts about the validity of a certain piece of evidence. Sample criteria include:

1) Reliability- Does the source have a history of being accurate? A foreign policy expert who has misread previous conflicts may be an unreliable source for future conflicts. Likewise, an article from the *Wall Street Journal* is a more reliable analysis of the stock market than an editorial from the *Sacramento Bee*.

2) Expertise- Does the source have knowledge and background in the area of question? A U.S. senator may not necessarily be an expert on foreign policy, and it is unlikely a 16th century philosopher can offer insight into the politics of nuclear weapons.

3) Objectivity- Does the source have an unbiased viewpoint on the topic in question? Citing an NRA member during a debate on gun control or a network executive during a discussion of TV violence will not provide a balanced opinion.

4) External Consistency- Is the opinion expressed consistent with generally accepted knowledge? Certainly, one should not assume that all general knowledge is correct (i.e. people used to think that the earth was flat), but if one wants to argue that tobacco is not harmful he bears a heavy burden of proof and must provide more than "one card" to win the point.

5) Internal Consistency- Is the opinion expressed similar to previous comments made by the source? If not, it does not disqualify the remark (the source may have changed his/her mind, but it can raise doubt's as to the source's credibility.

6) Recency- Is the date of the evidence important to the discussion at hand? For broad, philosophical discussions about liberty, recency is not a major issue. However, for a debate over international terrorism the date of evidence can be very critical, for the situation is constantly changing.

7) Access- Did the source witness the events he/she is commenting on firsthand? If not, the source may have a distorted view of actual events. (example: Alexis de Tocqueville wrote an entire analysis of American politics after being in the country less than two years!)

8) Relevance- Does the expressed opinion directly relate to the question at hand? (example: proving that the Catholic Church condemns abortion does NOT automatically mean abortion is immoral; one must further prove that the Catholic Church is a barometer of morality.)

Legitimacy Tests

Many times debaters manipulate evidence to say what they want to say. Be aware of these common practices:

1) Omitting words from a quotation (Ex: *Boston Tribune's* criticism of *Attack of the Killer Ants* edited to say "best picture of the year.") **NOTE**: you can make this argument only if the statement is illogical or if you have the original.

2) Using secondary sources instead of primary sources (Ex: An analysis of the Declaration of Independence is not the same thing as using the actual document.)

3) Failing to provide complete citation- If your opponent cannot tell you the qualifications of his/her source then you can challenge the evidence's credibility.

4) Using pseudo-statistics- These are statistical arguments which cannot possibly be proven (Ex: 7 out of 10 Americans believe in God; new nuclear power plants are seventeen times safer than older models) How are these statistics compiled?

5) Using unrepresentative samples- Polls cannot be considered legitimate unless they were conducted in such a manner that a broad cross-section of people were questioned (Ex: the recent *USA Today* poll which shows that soccer is now more popular than baseball was taken at professional soccer matches).

Summarized from Barbara Warnick and Edward S. Inch's *Critical Thinking and Communication: The Use of Reason in Argument* (Macmillan, 1994)

Constructives

Steps in Building the Constructive

1) Define the terms of the definition so you know exactly what the resolution is talking about; try to keep several definitions on hand so that you can determine later which definition is the most appropriate.

2) Break down the resolution (see **Resolutional Analysis**). Determine what the burden of proof for both the Affirmative and Negative are, for this will help you focus your case later.

3) Research the general area of the topic area (Some of your best arguments will arise from this preliminary research.)

4) Brainstorm!!! Based on what you have read and what you know about the topic, try to determine why someone might choose to value the affirmative or the negative position. Which values does each side support? What does your evidence say? How do you feel? The more reasons you can come up with for each side the more prepared you will be to both write your case and refute your opponents. (HINT- the best brainstorming is done with your coach and/or teammates).

5) When brainstorming is complete, take your 5-7 best and most logical arguments for each side of the resolution and do specific research. Look up (a) a philosophical justification for each reason and the value which it corresponds to and (b) specific pragmatic evidence which preferably relates directly to the general topic area. When you've researched all of your arguments, decide which ones are strong enough to stand as contentions. (Make sure each contention meets your side's burden of proof and flows well with the other contentions.) Once you have established your contentions you are ready to write!

What is a constructive?

The constructives, also known as cases (either the affirmative constructive or the negative constructive) are the speeches in which the debaters initially explain their positions to the judge. They should be clear, concise, and developed specifically around a given resolution. There are many different types of constructives, and it is necessary to understand all of them so that, when writing cases, you can choose which type is most appropriate for the resolution. Additionally, understanding different case types enables you to respond more effectively to your opponents' cases.

Reminder on resolutional analysis

To a degree, understanding the type of resolution you are debating will dictate the sort of case which you write. With very few exceptions, resolutions cane be divided into four groups:

1. **Absolute:** Defines the way something ought to be.

> Example: Capital punishment is justified.

2. **Superlative:** Something ought to be held in the highest value.

> Example: The primary duty of a congressman is to honor the will of his constituents.

3. **Hierarchy/comparison:** One object/subject is more important when conflicting with another.

> Example: When they conflict, native American sovereignty ought to take precedence over state and/or national sovereignty. (the phrase "when in conflict" clues you in to this sort of resolution.)

4. **Advantage/Disadvantage:** A resolution that calls for a cost-benefit analysis.

Example: The advantages of a moral education outweighs the disadvantages.

Basic case structure

Most cases have similar basic structures within which there is tremendous variation. This structure consists of five basic components:

1. Introduction

This is usually a quote or anecdote. It should be interesting, a good "attention grabber."

2. Statement of the resolution

At some point in your cases, make sure to state the resolution verbatim. (Note: There is only one resolution. Negatives should not try to offer a negative version of a resolution. Either Affirm or Negate the proposition as offered.)

3. Observations

By definition, observations are not arguments. They are neutral statements of protocol or clarification used to better explain your case, your method, and the parameters of the round. **Note:** Observations are just that, neutral objective OBSERVATIONS of the way things are and the methods you will employ. Observations should **not** be argumentative, and should be framed in such a way that your opponent will have no difficulty granting them as neutral parameters for the round.

> **A.   Definitions**
>
> These are explanations of the terms in the resolution. See IV.1.
>
> **B.   Values and/or criteria**
>
> These will be analyzed later at great length. Be patient.
>
> **C.   Other Observations**
>
> These may be, for example, parameters set on the round to eliminate the use of terribly extreme examples. Be careful not to turn these into arguments.

4.   Contentions

These are your arguments. Some debaters, for the sake of organization, divide contentions into "sub-points," each of which prove independent points of analysis which all fit under the heading of a single contention. These should be grounded in syllogistic logic based on philosophical, historical, and common-sensical evidence.

5.   Conclusion

Close with a summary of your arguments, and generate a lasting impression for your judge.

Negative constructives have a sixth component, which is a refutation of the affirmative case. The negative constructive is a seven minute speech. Roughly half of this time should be devoted to building the negative philosophy, and the other half should be spent on refutation of the specific Affirmative arguments.

Universal components of successful constructives

The following is a list of properties that all good constructives should have. It would not be a bad idea to draw up a checklist of the following properties and go through it after writing a case. If a case has all of these properties, you can bet that it is pretty solid. Both affirmative and negative cases should contain all of the following:

1. Appropriate explanation of terms (definitions)

Generally, it is the job of the affirmative to define terms. These definitions should be fair, and they must be neutral. While the negative does not have the burden of defining terms, s/he should always have a set of neutral definitions prepared to rebut the affirmative's definitions should they be unfair.

2. Unifying theme or analysis

This is one of the most important attributes of any good case. A case becomes much, much "tighter" if it has a few ideas which are implicit in all of the points. It also makes it easier for a judge to remember the basic premises of your case throughout the round.

3. Philosophical foundation

This is the reason we teach you so much philosophy. All cases, even those pertaining to   policy based resolutions, must contain some philosophical analysis. "Philosophical foundation" doesn't necessarily require cited philosophical texts. While these surely will enhance the credibility of your position, a good case must contain some philosophical thought (i.e. thought about thought).

4. Logical foundation

This is the reason we teach you so much argument theory. All cases must contain logical arguments. The structure of arguments should be syllogistic, with conclusions drawn deductively from premises. Each premise, as well as the links between the premises and conclusion should be substantiated by philosophical, historical, and/or commonsensical evidence.

5. Topic-specific content

If a topic involves due process in the United States, your case should be based on due process in the United States, and not the general philosophy of legal proceedings. Many people write cases which are way too general. A good debater can tear them to shreds because their applications are somewhat farfetched by default. If the same case can be used for more than one topic, something is wrong with it.

6. Historical examples

These always add to the credibility of cases, especially with regard to policy-oriented topics. However, make sure that when you use a historical example, you understand both the example, and the social context in which the historical event occurred. It is very embarrassing to have an example shredded because your opponent knows more about your example than you do.

7. Common-sense world view

This is often the hardest thing to integrate into a case. It's much easier to research and support philosophical and historical arguments than commonsense arguments. However, arguments based in commonsense need less scholarly support than other arguments because they hold water by themselves — after all, any person would believe them. They are the most effective type of argument when a lay judge is in the room.

8. Identification and challenge of presumptions and assumptions

Wen you write your cases, consider what presumptions and assumptions your judges and opponents hold on the topic. For example, if you are sure that most of your opponents will run a certain argument, you might want to build a response to that argument into your case. If you know that the judges are going to be biased, then account for that bias in your cases.

9. Clear, diverse contentions

Never allow your opponent the opportunity to say "my opponent's first contention is the same as his second— let's group them and deal with the whole assumption" and get away with it. This makes your case very weak because it has fewer distinct arguments. However, in designing cases with diverse contentions, don't forget that all contentions, no matter how diverse, should have a common theme which unifies them.

10. Clear, concise language

Read your case to your ten-year-old sibling. If they can't understand every word, you've done something wrong.

11. A discussion of all parts of the resolution

I've seen many, many debaters lose rounds because their cases didn't possess this attribute. Especially in hierarchical resolutions, if a case does not discuss both things (values, etc.) to be ranked in a hierarchy, it is not complete. Don't debate only half of the resolution.

(Thanks to Richard Hunsaker's lectures and others for contributions to this list.)

Timing Elements of the Constructive

1) INTRODUCTION- this is some quotation, story, anecdote, or historical example which outlines your general position on the resolution (i.e. the resolution is true or false.) Make sure the introduction relates directly to the actual debate topic! Try to be creative and get the audience's attention, but don't spend more than 15-20 seconds on the intro.

2) RESOLUTION- state what it is and whether you agree or disagree with it.

3) DEFINITIONS- define the major terms (Don't waste much time here!)

4) CRITERIA- for any unified case, the criteria is always the same, but you can word it to your personal taste: "The criteria for today's round should be who best demonstrates the validity or invalidity of the resolution."

5) PREVIEW- give a statement foreshadowing what your contentions will be. Make sure you identify your burden of proof and how you plan to meet it. (i.e. "The affirmative will now demonstrate that term limits on federal legislators would be desirable because first, term limits would foster democracy; second, term limits would establish equality in the legislature; and finally, term limits would decrease corruption in government.")

6) OBSERVATIONS- If necessary, these come immediately after the preview. Many LDers do not understand the purpose of observations, so here it is: observations merely state what should be accepted facts which do not favor one side or the other. Observations are not arguments, and they are not a place where debaters should be reading cards. Their main strategic purpose is to remind the judge of the parameters of the debate so as to pre-empt any non-topical arguments. Make observations short, and use them sparingly.

(Note: at this point your case should ideally be approximately 1:30, but it should NEVER be longer than 2:00)

7) CONTENTIONS- these are the backbone of a case. For Affirmative, you should have 2-4, and for negative 2-3. Each contention is an independent proof of your burden of proof, and each contention should demonstrate which values the resolution does or does not support. Make sure there is a transition between each contention.

(Note: when you finish all of your contentions your Affirmative case should be between 5:00 and 5:15; your Negative case between 3:15 and 3:45 max)

8) CONCLUSION- this part of the case is very short and VERY important. A good conclusion does three things: (a) reviews the contentions just like the preview, (b) ties back into the intro or provides some concluding quotation, and (c) ends with a call for the judge to affirm or negate the resolution (NOT please vote affirmative or negative).

(Note: when you finish the Affirmativecase should be 5:45-5:55; 3:30-4:00 on the Negative; make sure you get a consistent time on the case and we highly recommend you memorize some or all of the case)

Different case types

A. Strict core value

The core value system is based on the assumption that an LD topic can be best analyzed when a debater develops arguments into one central, "core" value which should permeate all aspects of the case. Unfortunately, while this technique can be very persuasive, very few debaters do it well. As a result, LD judges have been known to scoff at statements such as, "My value premise for today's round will be justice." If you choose to run a core value case, it is critical that you understand the following.

To offer a core value is to say that there are certain concepts of value which exist at the root of our evaluative processes. The term "core" comes from Milton Rokeach, a value theorist who suggested that our value systems are kind of like onions, and the more you peel the layers the closer you will come to the most central values.

The core value. In theory, the core value is the "good thing" which is obtained by either an affirmation or a negation. It is not implicit in the resolution, but simply a byproduct of its implementation (or lack thereof). Although the core value is theoretically the heart of a core value case, it is often the most underdeveloped section of a core value case. A good core value should be drawn from the arguments, not the other way around. That is, when writing cases, you should determine your arguments before you determine your core value. For example, an affirmative debating "Resolved: that term limits for federal legislators are justified," might consider the following arguments: (1) term limits reduce government corruption, (2) term limits are in accordance with popular will, and (3) term limits guarantee an influx of fresh ideas into Congress. A debater with these arguments should choose a value such as "democracy" or "responsive government" because these values link the themes of all three points nicely. Debaters should never choose arbitrary values (justice is the most common) and then try to develop arguments which fit that value. Typically, these are the easiest cases to defeat because the logical and argumentative bases are underdeveloped.

Contentions. The contentions in a core value case must be linked directly to your core value. For example, if your core value was democracy, all of your contentions would have   to show how upholding your side of the resolution promotes democracy. Therefore, in a core value case, your contentions should do two things: (1) make a logically sound argument, and (2) link that argument to the core value. So long as your contentions always return to the core value, your case will be much stronger analytically.

Strenths/Weaknesses: If used well, the core value system can be very effective. When there is a carefully constructed core value enforced by well-founded arguments, the value can be very difficult to crack. The problem is that few debaters are able to effectively use the core value system. As a result, when your opponent runs a core value case, be sure to attack all aspects of the values (Is it defined? Is it significant? Does the value relate to the topic? Are the contentions true?). If you can demonstrate that the core value of the case is somehow faulty or underdeveloped, then you have crippled a core value debater. Always remember that when a debater offers a "core value," they are claiming that the decision making process is dependent upon the shared assumptions of valuation related to that core. Knock out the core, and by definition the case should be invalid (even prior to refutation of the specific arguments).

B. Value system

Value system cases differ from core value cases in their recognition that there is no such thing as a single value laden concept which determines all of our action decisions. Rokeach also noted that values do not exist in a vacuum. They are interrelated and highly dependent upon the context of the situation. Value systems attempt to essentialize the most basic values implicit in certain systems of thought. For example, the "American Democratic ideal" and most conceptions of the "social contract" are value systems, complex interactions of values that, taken as a whole, prescribe certain obligations.

Value systems cases, instead of limiting the perspective to one "core value," offer several interrelated values that comprise the system, usually 2-4 different values. Each contention in the case demonstrates how the position achieves each of the values. For example, if a a system dictated the values of freedom and virtue, it would be supported by two contentions: 1) Affirming/negating the resolution achieves freedom, and 2) Affirming/negating the resolution achieves virtue. If you run a value system case, it is crucial to make sure that the values you choose are interrelated. That is, by achieving one of the values, you should help to achieve another. Make sure that the values in the values system are not contradictory. Do not, for example, run a value system case with the values of freedom and security.

C. Core value with criterion (and multiple criteria)

This is the most common type of "core value" case. Core value with criterion cases have three components: a core value, a criterion (or criteria), and contentions. The core value serves the same purpose that it does in a straight core value case. The

criterion defines a method of achieving that value, or describes a method of weighing one value against another. For example, a debater might say that his value is democracy and that his criterion is government objectivity. He would argue that in order for a government to be democratic it would have to be objective. In this case type, the core value must be logically linked to the value; if it is not, the case is worthless. In fact, the lack of a link between the value and the criterion is the case weakness that is most prevalent on the LD circuit. The contentions in a core value with criterion case demonstrate how, by affirming or negating the resolution, the criterion is met. The understanding, because of the link between the value and the criteria, is that by meeting the criterion, the value is achieved. Thus, the contentions generally focus on the criterion and not on the value.

This case type can also be run with multiple criteria. In this variation, the debater chooses more than one criterion, each of which is logically linked to the value. Each contention demonstrates how the debater meets one of his criteria. In this case type, the relationship between the contentions and the criteria is identical to the relationship between the contentions and values in a value system case.

There is one overarching demand of core value with criterion cases: the criterial position can NOT be arbitrary. The criterion or criteria must be both a) necessary to the achievement of the value, and b) sufficient for the complete attainment of the value.

D. Philosophical criteria

An alternative to the previous case types is the philosophical criteria case. It only works well with certain types of resolutions. This case type assumes that there is already one broad, obvious value inherent to the resolution. Rather than introduce a value drawn from outside the resolution, this case structure assumes a value from the resolution and focuses on the criteria as the crux of the case. This system eliminates the problems of finding and justifying a core value, but it only works with certain types of topics. In this case type, criteria are obtained from a philosophical work, and not composed by the debater. The "core value" is obtained directly from the resolution.

When to use the philosophical criteria system. This case type works best with absolute resolutions which label actions or things as "moral," or "justified." It also works with heierarchical resolutions which assess whether one action is moral or less moral or less just than another. The "core value" of the philosophical criteria system is the standard against which the actions or things in the resolution are being compared (in the previous example, these are morality and justice. For example, given the resolution, "Resolved: that abortion is moral," one could assume the "core value" of morality. Such a debater could argue that to prove the resolution true (or false), s/he would only have to prove that abortion does (or does not) meet the conditions required for morality. This statement would stand in lieu of an actual core value. If the value is already found in full in the resolution, one would have a difficult time offering another value and staying within the juristiction of the resolutional claim.

The philosophical criteria. The heart of a philosophical case is, of course, the criteria. The debater needs to present a clearly defined criteria which have a credible source. For example, a debater might write in his constructive, "The resolution before us today is 'resolved, that term limits are justified.' Obviously, the resolution asks us to evaluate term limits by the standard of justice. As John Locke explains in his *Second Treatise on Civil Government,* for something to be just in a democratic society, it must meet the following criteria....." Here, the criteria are obtained from John Locke. After presenting the criteria, the debater must justify why the criteria s/he offers are appropriate for the topic. Just as with the core value case format, the debater must clearly link the criteria back to the resolution and make sure the contentions link directly to the criteria.

Contentions. As in the core value with criteria method, the contentions in the philosophical criteria style should be linked directly to the criteria themselves. If your criteria call for A, B, and C, then your contentions should each address A, B, and C. Thus, in each contention make sure that you (1) make a well-structured, logically sound argument, (2) link the argument to he criteria, and (3) remind the audience how this contention reflects back on the resolution itself.

Strenths/weaknesses: The philosophical criteria system allows the debater to avoid the pitfalls of having to create and defend a core value. The philosophical criteria case is also more straight-forward than the core value case, so it is usually easier to defend, though more difficult to write. However, the philosophical criteria system hinges on the acceptance of the criteria, so if a debater can undermine his opponent's criteria by showing either that it is inappropriate or that it is nor well-developed, the entire case will likely fall. When you hit a core value case, make sure your opponent tells you not only everything there is to know about his or her criteria, but also why those criteria should be accepted as parameters by which to evaluate the round.

E. Value standard

Values as standards serve as guides for proper behavior. Philosophy tells us that abstract, perfect forms of values are unattainable. In our everyday actions, we know that we can not "achieve" a state of justice, for example. All we can do is abide by the abstract principle.

The value standard case approaches the resolution from the perspective of "codes of behavior." Affirmation or negation is not

perceived as instrumental to the attainment of an exterior value, but rather abides by a standard of action or code of behavior rooted in absolute values. Keep in mind Plato's *theory of forms* when writing a value standard case— the values are abstract, absolute, and unwavering, and resolutions either are or are not consistent with those abstract value forms. As a result, value standard cases deal with resolutions in light of epistemological end states rather than in mechanistic achievement (or instrumentality) claims.

The value standard case begins with the selection of an appropriate universal value. These values include broader forms of typical core values, such as Justice, Virtue, Truth, Morality, Wisdom (or Rationality), Idealism, Goodness, Individualism, Societal Good, and so forth. After presenting the value standard, it must be defined clearly in its most abstract form (this is why Rawls won't work in defining Justice as a universal standard— his system of justice (Distributive Justice) is rooted in other universals, such as Benificence, Fairness and Virtue). Having defined the value clearly, the student must then extract the *Premise* of the value. **Note:** A premise is a statement of position upon which a deductive conclusion can be founded— single words don't serve as premises!! The premise must offer to the judge and your opponent a Code of Conduct (the Confucian "social way of virtue" or *dao de*).

Finally, the debater should construct two or three arguments which examine the resolution in light of the principles of conduct extracted from the standard. Very often, those contentions will be rooted in the terminology offered in the definition of the value standard (that is why that definition is crucial to the development of the standard).

To set up an evaluative standard, the syntax goes something like this:

"In order to make this determination, it is essential that we abide by the standard of _____, which is defined as _____. Those actions consistent with [the standard] are those best worth pursuing."

That definition is VERY IMPORTANT, and is often grounded in a particular philosophical perspective. For example:

The standard of "Moral Idealism" is defined as the practice of abidance by the standards for right behavior. Immanuel Kant gives us an appropriate structure for determining what is right or moral behavior in accordance with moral idealism, and he calls this the "Categorical Imperative." Kant's original formulation of the CI reads, "act only on that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law." When evaluating an action or alternative, it must first be translated into a universal maxim, then the maxim must be tested in terms of its circumstances and desirability.

Let's take a look at that desirability as we turn to the first contention...

Strenths/Weaknesses: The value standard case fixes a logical link problem often found in typical core value cases. Because core value cases often construct arbitrary criterial arguments that are neither necessary nor sufficient, the values can be picked apart with ease. The value standard reappropriates the value concept and offers it as a universal code of conduct. Value standard cases can be more difficult to write for absolute and superlative resolutions, though, because value standards are by definition absolute and superlative concepts. However, when a value standard is extracted directly *from* the absolute or superlative resolution (e.g. "Capital punishment is moral" ==> Morality; "the primary duty of a Congressperson" ==> Duty), the value standard becomes very effective, and is one of the strongest case approaches you can take.

The value standard case is one of the strongest case types because values do not have to be watered down by specific application to circumstances. The value standard works in the reverse: take the situation and examine it with the value as a guidepost for right action.

F. Unified Analysis

The unified approach to analysis provides sound reasons or proofs for a specific claim. The measure of analytical success should be in the persuasive scope of the reasoning. If a resolution can be demonstrated to be justified in great measure, then the value of affirmation of the resolution has also been demonstrated. If a resolution can be shown to be unjustified in great measure, then its negation has been shown to be more valuable than its affirmation.

In addition, the unified approach to value constructives keeps the focus of debate on the resolutional issue by showing the contingencies of a value system in the context of the resolution rather than a single item of value which, in the course of the debate, becomes synonomous with the resolutional issue (the "my value is bigger than your value" approach).The unified analysis case type approaches a resolution from the perspective of pure argumentation. In drafting such a case, the debater first establishes a definitive opinion on the resolution, either an affirmation or negation, and then offers specific, individually unique arguments in favor of that resolution. These contention must all be exquisitely linked to the resolution itself. They are not linked to exterior values and/or criteria, but instead embed the values directly within the argumentative contentions. Because of its simplicity, this is one of the more effective case types, especially with lay judges. Unified cases explain a position

without convoluting it with additional values and/or criteria. **Note:** The major difference between a unified case and a systems case is that unification does not require an established system of thought. The interrelationships of the distinct values implicit in each unified contention are rooted in their references to the resolution.

Unified analysis is rooted in the assumptions that the resolution has implicit value, while many other case types (core value especially) are based on the notion that a resolution is good or bad because it does or does not foster the achievement of an additional value, or appeal to a given standard. As a result, in unified analysis, if a resolution can be demonstrated to be justified, then the value of the affirmation of the resolution has been demonstrated as well. Conversely, if a resolution can be shown to be unjustified, then its negative has been shown to be more valuable than its affirmation.

In other words, in any unified case, the criterion is always the same, although it can be worded in any way you like. An example of this wording is, "The criterion for today's round should be who best demonstrates the validity or invalidity of the resolution." That criterion can take many forms, though. For example, "the criterion for today's round is the rational paradigm. Whoever offers the most complete rationale for affirmation or negation should win the decision." For additional example, "the criterion for today's round should be Best Reasons Morality, as defined by Kurt Baier. Best Reasons Morality dictates that the moral position with the best reasons for acceptance should be the obvious choice."

G. Negative Case Construction

The negative debater has two burdens of proof: (1) to show that the reasoning of the affirmative is invalid and (2) to offer independent justifications for the negation of the resolution. Failure to do either of these things puts the negative at a severe disadvantage. Remember, the negative is urging the negation of the original resolution, so the negative should not create a new one! (Ex: With the resolution "Resolved: that freedom is of greater value than security," the negative can freely say, "I urge you you to recognize that security is considerably more valuable than freedom for the following reasons...")

Structure

1) Introduction (10-20 sec.)
2) Counter-definitions if necessary
3) Presentation of unified criteria and preview of arguments

> *(Note: at this point the Negative case should be no more than 1 minute long)*

4) Offer two or three separate arguments negating the resolution
5) Brief conclusion; remind the judge of the reasons the resolution is invalid

> *(Note: at this point the Negative case should be between 3:30 and 4 minutes long)*

6) Refute Affirmative case

> *(Note: Some debaters may choose to refute the Affirmative before presenting their Negative case. This move can make a debater appear more prepared and aggressive, but it can be disastrous if a debater runs out of time before presenting his full case! Therefore, this strategy should be used ONLY by experienced debaters who have a good grasp of time allocation.)*

H. Flex-Neg

The most advanced (and most effective) negative case type is the flexible negative (or flex-neg). The flex-neg maximizes the negative's two inherent advantages, the ability to cover far more issues in one speech than the affirmative, and the fact that the negative hears the affirmative case before presenting its own. Unfortunately, a flexible negative is also the most difficult case type to implement in the actual round, and it should only be attempted by debaters who are exceptional at research and conscious of time allocation.

The flexible negative works by preparing separate fully researched arguments which can be used both to refute the affirmative case and at the same time build an independent and unified negative case. In each round, the negative "case" will change, depending on the arguments presented by the affirmative. Also, because the arguments in a flexible negative vary from round to round, it is virtually impossible to come up with exterior values and/or criteria as evaluative lenses. As a result, flexible negatives are almost always of the unified analysis case type (see next section on Unified Analysis and Flex Negs for more details).

Building a flexible negative. First, brainstorm and research as many arguments as possible for the given resolution. For a flex-neg to be successful, you will need to generate at least seven arguments in this stage. Given the resolution, "Resolved: term limits for federal legislators are justified," a negative might prepare the following arguments:

> a. Term limits deny freedom of choice to voters.

   b. Term limits would increase congressional corruption.

   c. Term limits disrupt the balance of power in government.

   d. Experienced legislators do a better job.

   e. Term limits prevent long-term legislation from being passed.

   f. Legislators are more accountable to voters without term limits.

   etc.

After thoroughly researching potential negative arguments, the negative should consider the most popular affirmative arguments and research the strongest negative responses to them. For the above resolution on term limits, popular affirmative arguments might include:

   a. Voters want term limits.

   b. Term limits decrease corruption in government.

   c. Term limits prevent legislators from losing touch with voters.

   etc.

After analyzing and researching these arguments, the affirmative should prepare responses to them. Then, after eliminating duplicate arguments, the negative should develop briefs on each argument, and each argument should take approximately one minute to read. These brief arguments should be written as if they were going to be contentions in a negative case. This implies that each contention should be written oratorically with both pragmatic and philosophical evidence and should contain all the major elements of an argument (claim, support, warrant, and justification). Additionally, the negative should find other miscellaneous evidence and file it in some organized format in case the affirmative presents a unique argument that the negative is not prepared for. The negative should also prepare an additional file of evidence to use when responding to core values. Finally, the negative should also make post-its with each of the prepared arguments to aid in flowing because a debater using a flexible negative cannot preflow before a round.

Using a flexible negative. After the affirmative constructive, the negative should do the following in prep time: (1) Determine which affirmative arguments you have prepared for, and pull those briefs; (2) Consult your additional evidence (and your brain) to refute any unique affirmative arguments; (3) Choose your strongest 2 or 3 remaining arguments and use those for you unified negative case. Additionally, when refuting the affirmative case, do not read your briefs word for word. Instead, you should present them as you would an ordinary refutation. You should know your briefs well enough that you can extemporize the argument, referring to the brief only to read the evidence. Do try to be as oratorical as possible, nonetheless.

For the term limits resolution, let us pretend that the affirmative presents the following case:

   Core value: justice

   Value criterion: individual rights

   Contention 1: The voters want term limits.

   Contention 2: Term limits provide equality of influence to all Americans.

   Contention 3: Term limits create more responsive legislators.

Let us assume that the negative has created the following briefs:

   a. Term limits deny freedom of choice to voters.

   b. Term limits would increase congressional corruption.

   c. Term limits disrupt the balance of power in government.

   d. Experienced legislators do a better job.

e. Term limits prevent long-term legislation from being passed.

f. Legislators are more accountable to voters without term limits.

g. Voters do not want term limits.

Ideally, the negative would have more arguments prepared, but if this was the way the round unfolded, the negative should do the following: (1) Use separate value research to attack the core value and value criterion; (2) Use brief "g" to refute the first affirmative contention; (3) Use miscellaneous (but nonetheless pre-prepared) evidence to refute the second affirmative contention because there is no prepared brief that directly refutes it; (4) Use brief "d," "f," or both to refute the third affirmative contention; and (5) choose the best remaining contentions (definitely "b" and "c," possibly followed by "a" or "c") to form a negative case.

Through this strategy, the negative would force the affirmative to respond to at least seven arguments in the 1AR. This is a difficult task considering that the affirmative would be limited to approximately 34 seconds per argument. The affirmative's task is made even more difficult considering that all of the negative arguments are the products of hours and hours of research.

Cross Examination in Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Cross examination (or CX, as it will be referred to throughout), is one of the most underrated aspects of LD. (It is, after all, 19% of the total round.) It is not merely a time to ask, "Would you repeat your second contention?" Instead, LDers should concentrate on clarifying the major issues and finding the flaws inherent to their opponents logic.

CX Etiquette

These are fundamental rules for handling one's self in CX:

1) **Always be professional!!!** Regardless of how insulting your opponent may be, never lose your composure. Smile, handle yourself with dignity, and answer any questions your opponent might have. Along those same lines, never attack your opponent's character, yell, throw things, slam doors, or do anything else you may have seen debaters do. It ruins the spirit of debate, annoys the judge, and will probably cost you massive speaker points if not the entire ballot. Be courteous!!!

2) Never be condescending or rude during CX; likewise, the ruder your opponent is the more polite you should be so that the judge notices how obnoxious your opponent is. This is not *legal* debate- you should not seek submission from your opponent.

3) Make sure you stand up to ask/answer questions. Always stand side by side with your opponent and face the judge. You should **always** maintain eye contact with the judge with occasional glances at your opponent. You may bring a legal pad with you to the front when you are asking questions to take notes. Occasionally, one of your opponents may do something unorthodox, such as sit down, face you to ask questions, or refuse to answer questions. If that is the case, smile and continue your cross examination without interruption. Your judge will instantly notice that you are confident and your opponent is clueless.

4) Always assume that your judge is paying attention. Never think that your judge is ignoring cross examination just because he/she is writing. Most judges are capable to do two things at once, and I assure you judges care about CX!

CX Question Types

There are six general types of CX questions:

1) *Questions of Clarity*: These types of questions seek to clarify the opponent's position. (i.e. What was your definition for 'moral'? Was the tag for your second contention 'Protecting national security at all costs ensures the general welfare?') These questions should remain very simple and very short. You should never spend more than 30-45 seconds asking these types of questions.

2) *Questions of Accuracy*: These questions challenge the accuracy of factual information presented by your opponent. (i.e. Are you positive that Hobbes condoned rebellion against the government? Wasn't Hitler elected democratically?)

3) *Questions of Context*: These questions contest the context of a particular argument based on temporal, cultural, or geographical differences. (i.e. Admittedly, the founding fathers wanted an armed populace, but they were not aware about machine gun technology then, were they?)

4) *Questions of Syllogism Construction*: With this question one criticizes the internal logic of a contention. It also points out the exceptions to the argument. In addition, this question exposes the false assumptions of the opponent's case. (i.e. Briefly, how could promoting universal medical care create an egalitarian state when doctors will be forced to ration care? Considering the recent physical attacks on sports celebrities, why is it beneficial to even further subject the private lives of famous people to public scrutiny?) These questions always revolve around the truth or benefit of an argument.

5) *Questions of Relevance*: One uses this line of questioning to determine if an opponent's argument is pertinent to the resolution. (i.e. I agree that nuclear weapons are a danger to society, but how does that prove that political interference in other nations is immoral?)

6) *Questions of Consistency*: These questions challenge the consistency of an opponents case and bring up the logical extensions of an opponent's argument. (i.e. If you argue in Contention 1 that we must take all steps necessary to protect the lives of people from physical attack, how can you claim in Contention 3 that we should use capital punishment, which takes life, to deter crime? If you argue that all men should defend their homes, would you advocate electric fences and barbed wire in residential neighborhoods?)

Questioning Skills

1) Whenever possible, ask questions in a Yes/No format. If you must ask a question which requires a longer answer, feel free to qualify your question with a "Briefly" or "In a few words." Never ask a question such as "Would you please explain your third contention again"— you might be opening the door for a mini-oratory.

2) To prevent long-winded opponents from trying to take over your CX, ask leading questions. These types of questions a phrased in a Yes/No format and force your opponent to be very specific. For example, rather than asking, "What was the reasoning behind Contention 3," ask, "Isn't your assumption in Contention 3 that democracy is good?"

3) Questions should be short and to the point. Long, complex questions usually have to be repeated or explained, which just wastes CX time.

4) Don't ask argumentative questions. Questions which read, "So because X is true, don't you lose your second Contention?" will earn nothing but a long rebuttal from your opponent. Just get them to admit X, and then make the argument in your next speech.

5) If you ask a question of fact (i.e. What year was the War of 1812?), make sure you know the answer!!! Otherwise, you are setting yourself to look stupid.

6) If you are asking questions and your opponent is long-winded, smile and politely cut him/her off saying, "Thank you, I think that gave me enough information..." If your opponent refuses to shut up, then just ask the next question- they will definitely be quiet to hear what you are saying. If your opponent persists is talking, then smile at the judge and relax, for your opponent is simply being rude and making you look good. After letting them make a jerk out of themselves for another moment, again try to cut them off.

7) Make sure that your questions are aimed to pursue a specific goal. Ask a series of questions that are designed to make your opponent admit something.

Trapping the opposition in their own circumlocution:

        Q- Your core value is justice, correct?

        A- Yes.

        Q- And your criteria for establishing justice is the maximization of individual rights?

        A- Yes.

        Q- Now, is it fair to say that you cannot maximize individual rights without protecting liberty?

        A- Certainly.

        Q- In a democracy, doesn't the government protect liberty?

        A- That is what it is supposed to do, yes.

        Q- Doesn't the government use laws to guarantee our liberty?

        A- Yes.

        Q- And these laws are ruled to be just or unjust by the Supreme Court, correct?

        A- Yes.

        Q- So what you are saying is that we must have justice to have liberty, we then need liberty for individual rights, and we then need individual rights for justice, correct?

        A- Well...

8) When you ask questions, that three minutes is yours to use at your discretion. Don't let your opponent dictate the time, and certainly don't let him/her avoid questions. "I appreciate your answer, but I think you misunderstood my question..."

9) Don't make statements during CX. Nothing makes you make more ridiculous than making some dramatic point only to have your opponent say, "I'm sorry, what is your question?"

10) Since you probably know what the major issues will be for any given topic, it wouldn't hurt to prepare some general questions in advance (But don't ask prepared questions which have nothing to do with your opponent's case!)

11) Try to get your opponent to simplify his/her case. Make them admit specifics; don't let them make generic, broad arguments. If you make your opponent admit a critical point, try to make him/her say it more than once- it only strengthens your case.

12) Be cunning. Don't use an obvious analogy, for any good debater will dodge the issue. Conceal what your true objectives are, and just try to get your opponent to grant certain small issues. Then, use these admissions to dismantle your opponent's logic in rebuttals.

13) When your opponent is speaking, it is wise to mark areas on your flow where you think there are flaws in the case. These are the areas where you need to ask questions. Make notes if necessary to let you know what you were thinking when you found the flaw. I promise that you will forget what you found within 10 seconds if you don't write it down.

14) **ALWAYS** refer back to CX during rebuttals. Nothing you say in CX will have any relevance to the round unless it is linked to an argument in the rebuttal. It is a good idea to carry a pen with you so that you can write down your opponent's responses and use them against him/her later.

CX Answering Skills

1) When you are answering questions, show courtesy and answer your opponents questions completely and concisely. Judges recognize and disapprove of people deliberately monopolizing other people's time. However, if someone asks you to explain your first contention again, feel free to take a little time to repeat your main ideas.

2) If a question is unclear, don't be afraid to ask for clarification. However, don't use it as a cheap time suck.

3) Don't be defensive or argumentative. Look confident, for just because your opponent is asking the questions does not make him/her right.

4) Don't get angry or say "That's a stupid question"- just be polite and answer the questions.

5) Don't be afraid to clarify your answer. If a yes/no question cannot be answered yes or no, say so. If your answer is contingent on something, then say "it depends" and say why. Again, don't be cute and try a time suck.

6) Take your time if you have to before answering a question. It's OK to pause a couple of seconds, especially if the question is complicated.

7) If you evidence for your answer, say so but do not read it unless asked to by your opponent. (P.S. If you say you have more evidence you had better have it!!!)

8) If you are cut off when clarifying your answer, don't force the issue. Smile, be polite, and look like the innocent victim of a brutish, abusive questioner you are. (In other words, be courteous and let the judge make comments on your opponent's rudeness.)

Rebuttals

Rebuttals are traditionally where the best LDers shine and the weakest LDers collapse. The three rebuttal speeches are where rounds are won and lost; thus some time should be taken in the classroom to ensure everyone knows how to structure a rebuttal speech.

Format

All rebuttals have four main parts:

> I. Preview (A general statement about the theme of the rebuttal; 10-15 seconds max.)
>
> II. Refutation of opponent's case
>
> III. Defense of own case
>
> IV. Conclusion/Summary (restates major issues and includes a call for caction)

The preview is a general statement which highlights the general direction of the rebuttal. (i.e. In today's round, my opponent and I have agreed that the security of the state is a worthy goal, yet my opponent has presented a faulty view of what security of the state actually is. Let us focus on these fallacies by examining my opponent's case...) A rebuttal should never begin with "I'll go Neg first, then Aff." A good debater should be able to communicate his/her roadmap in a more sophisticated fashion.

LDers should always reserve about 10-20 seconds in Affirmative rebuttals and 30-45 seconds in the Negative rebuttal to summarize the rebuttal. This summery should include a restatement of the major issues and a call for the judge to affirm or negate the resolution. (i.e. In retrospect, the negative has demonstrated conclusively that euthanasia is completely unjustified. Euthanasia not only endangers all patients to false diagnosis and threatens a societal disregard for life, but it actually causes economic problems which the Affirmative failed to account for in his/her case. Moreover, the Affirmative argument that quality of life is the goal of medicine has been proven false through my opponent's own admission that quality of life is a subjective concept. Thus, the resolution cannot be valid and I urge you to recognize that euthanasia is unjust) Obviously, in Affirmative rebuttals this summery should be much shorter, but any good rebuttal ends with a review of at least one or two major points and a call to action

Refutation - Beginning Skills

Refutation often confuses beginning debaters. The following tips are general guidelines for organizing a good rebuttal:

1) Wherever possible, combine issues. This is especially important on Affirmative when one is under tight time constraints. For example, if your opponents 2nd contention is that affirmative action produces more discrimination and your 1st contention is that affirmative action prevents more discrimination, then feel free to group them together and address them both. However, you must be **very** clear on the flow and make sure you refute any unique arguments your opponent may have had regarding the issue; additionally, the more back-up evidence you can use on these common arguments the better. Likewise, if your opponent's subpoints are all similar, it is acceptable to refute them en mass so long as you explain why you are grouping them together. Grouping is a necessity to any rebuttal, so practice at home before you go to a tournament.

2) Always cover everything!!! When grouping arguments, make sure you explain what you are doing so your opponent can't claim a dropped argument. Do not get hung up on one issue. Remember that if you are to cover all major issues you can afford to spend no more that 30-45 seconds per issue, so state your argument and move on. (As negative, you may have a little more time to play with, but not much, so be careful. Nothing is more embarrassing than running out of time in 2N)

3) You cannot go too fast or too slow. The affirmative may be granted a little leeway to speak at a slightly faster rate, but the negative has usually **no** excuse to speak faster than normal. If you go too slow, you will run out of time, so learn in practice what rate is the happy medium (Is a happy medium a joyful fortune teller?)

4) Always be clear where you are on the flow. Follow a logical progression of ideas down your opponent's case and then your own. Never skip around!!!

5) A horrible trend has developed in 2AR where the Aff states the "3 major voting issues." While this style will work well when the negative has made few arguments, it can be suicidal in close rounds for several reasons. First, you can never know what the judge will vote on, so you can never be sure if what you consider are the major voting issues is what the judge thinks is significant. Second, debaters usually pick the issues they think they are winning and drop everything else, which is not wise. A 2AR should move down the flow quickly and address the major issues, focusing on the arguments made in 2N. The best 2ARs do not necessarily cover every minute issue, but they do attack every major issue and leave the judge with an impression that the Aff possesses the organizational skills to cover all pertinent issues.

6) When structuring an argument in rebuttals, you should follow this organizational pattern:

      I. Quick statement of opponent's position

      II. Reasons why their argument is wrong (More than one is preferred; it is perfectly acceptable to say "My opponent's reasoning is flawed for three reasons: First...")

      III. The evidence proving your argument (All cards should be pretimed so that they are short and to the point)

      IV. A quick summery (i.e. Therefore, based on current figures there is no way Congress can be as stagnant as my opponent claims)

7) Always attack your opponent's case first, then rebuild your own (This way you end the speech on your ground).

8) In rebuttals, avoid rereading the evidence and/or wording used in your constructive. Rebuttals are not a time to repeat your case; instead, extend your arguments and apply them to the round.

9) **NO NEW ARGUMENTS!!!** You can extend previous analysis and evidence, but you cannot make brand new assertions in 2AR. (It may have worked for Kirk Cameron, but it won't work for you!!!)

10) If an argument has been dropped, briefly remind the judge what it was and how significant it was- then move on.

Refutation - Intermediate Skills

While debate is an extremely complicated "sport," there are actually only a limited number of ways a debater can respond to his/her opponent's arguments. The clever debater finds ways to mix these responses up so as to provide a comprehensive critique of an opponent's case.

Direct Refutation (Strongest response- challenges the validity of the claim)

   1) Cast Doubt (X is not necessarily true)

   2) Deny (X is not true)

   3) Turn

           a) Pure Turn (X is true, but is supports the other side)
           b) Flip (The opposite of X is true)

Indirect Refutation (Weaker response- challenges proof of the claim only)

   1) Attack Evidence/ Sources

   2) Point Out Contradictions

   3) Deny Significance (X is true, but so what)

A more advanced way of looking at arguments is by applying the validity/significance test. For every claim that your opponent makes you should ask yourself two questions: (1) Is this claim valid, and (2) Is this claim significant or good? Below are some examples of how the validity/significance test can be used to attack arguments:

| CLAIM | *A causes B (Individual liberty promotes free will)* |

| RESPONSE | B is bad (Free will is dangerous) |

B is irrelevant (Free will is not an issue)

B causes C, and C is bad (Free will results in chaos, which is harmful)

A does not cause B or X, not A, causes B (We have free will with or without liberty)

A does cause B, but it also causes C,D,E... (Liberty causes death and pestilence...)

| CLAIM | *A is good (Democracy is intrinsically good)* |

| RESPONSE | A is bad (Democracy is harmful) |

A cannot be evaluated (Dem. can be good or bad)

A is irrelevant (Dem. does not link to the topic)

Opponent does not cause A (Aff doesn't even insure dem.)

I cause A too (So What? I support dem. too)

A is good, but B is better (Dem is cool, but comm rocks!)

Using Preparation Time

Most people know that prep time is designed to allow organization of a rebuttal. However, there are some basic rules of which everyone needs to be aware:

1) Never ask for a specific amount of time such as 1:30. You may need more time, and a judge may believe that you are disorganized because you request additional time. ALWAYS ask to be notified every 30 seconds (Not every 35.4 seconds!); when you receive notification either remain silent or offer a brief nod of the head or a quick "thank you"- noting more is expected (or wanted!)

2) Before the tournament begins, you should already have prepared responses to the "big" arguments. Therefore, prep time should be used exclusively to address any unique arguments, pull evidence, and organize the rebuttal. Generally, you should aim for using 1:30 each break, but try to never use less than 1 minute or more than 2 minutes at any one point.

3) ALWAYS use prep time! Nothing annoys a judge more than someone who leaps up the minute his/her opponent stops speaking. Even if a case is ridiculously simple, take 1 minute to organize your thoughts and think of a clever twist that will blow the judge away (You never know who might be judging you next week...)

4) When someone else is prepping, you should prepare as well by pulling cards an/or outlining anticipated responses. At the very least, sit QUIETLY and do not distract anyone in the room. The negative should never start putting things away until after the 2AR (RUDE!)

5) Remember, you are always being judged. Someone will notice if you appear smug, frantic or nervous during prep time. Simply appear calm and professional, and never forget that prep time does not end until you START to speak.

Flowing

Flowing is a system of recording your opponent's arguments as well as your own responses. Since it is impossible to write down everything which is said during a debate, each debater should develop his/her own system of shorthand and symbols. In general, there is no right or wrong way to flow, but there are some general do's and don'ts:

1) Listening is the key to creating a good flow (as well as winning most rounds). Always focus first on recording your opponent's words and **then** note your own responses. Don't waste time making immature noises or facial reactions- you'll miss something important and annoy the judges.

2) Write just large enough so that your words can be read at an arm's length (too small- flowpad covers face; too big- waste paper/disorganized). Ideally, you should flow the entire round on 1-2 sheets of paper. Additionally, write legibly! (The definition of embarrassment is admitting in 1AR that you must drop your opponent's 3rd contention because you cannot read your handwriting!)

3) Many debaters find it helpful to use two different colors to represent the different sides. If you choose to do this, pick two bright, contrasting colors. (i.e. black and red, but not blue and purple.)

4) You need to create your own system of symbols and abbreviations, but keep them consistent (i.e. don't use CONT. to represent 'Contention' and 'Contradicts,' for you will be confused.)

5) There are any number of methods to organize a flow— horizontal, vertical, split-page, convergent. All of these techniques are successful, but be familiar with more than one so you can be flexible (i.e. A seven contention affirmative case will probably require a split-page, not a horizontal or vertical flow.)

6) When flowing, **ALWAYS** record definitions, values, criteria, main contentions, subpoints, and the evidence used for each argument. Ideally, you should also note source citations and write down your own responses as well.

7) It is always helpful to carry a preflow of your affirmative and negative cases. These preflows should be as detailed as possible so that you will know if your opponent has missed something. Either carry a permanent preflow or make them OUTSIDE, BEFORE the round- don't waste the judge's time preflowing!

Warrancy: Where's That Link?

Since at least the times of Plato and Aristotle, we have grappled with the tension between philosophy and rhetoric. That is to say that we have been aware of a distinction between, first, what we rationalize in formal logic and philosophical dialectic, and second, how we respond to persuasion.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate stands at the crossroads of the two disciplines. We profess a love and need for philosophy, its history and its logical syllogism. Debaters engage in a formalized sort of dialectic over normative issues. In the same moment, these students test our resolve, demonstrating time and again that any proposition of value can be valid and invalid at the same time, depending on your perspective. L-D is a perfect synthesis of Platonic and Aristotelian ideals.

The synthesis is not without its problems, however. We are faced with the necessity of creating arguments which are both philosophically sound and rhetorically appealing.

It was in the 1940's that Stephen Toulmin took to the study of this fusion. From the publication in 1948 of his doctoral thesis, *Reason in Ethics*, Toulmin's ideas helped to shape the way we think about ethics, reasoning, and values, and his work gives us some directions to think about in constructing value based arguments.

Toulmin began with a belief that traditional logic, especially the formal syllogism, is incomplete as a tool for studying reason (Foss, et al, 78). He studied the structure and anatomy of effective arguments across disciplines. While he did not mean to prescribe how arguments should be constructed, he did define the basic vocabulary for the structure of arguments.

There are many elements to a sophisticated argument, but the basic structure is that data or proof (*grounds*) leads from demonstrated reasoning (*warrant*) to a conclusion (or *claim*).

Obviously a claim will seem unconvincing without support. What Toulmin's model makes clear, though, is that proof and claim are not enough. They must be linked together in some way. The reasoning, or warrant, must be clear.

In his analysis of arguments, Toulmin noted that warrants were often subtle. In practical conversations, we share certain assumptions which create unstated warrants. In debate, however, those warrants must be made explicitly clear in order to validate both the logic and rhetoric of the argument.

Debaters must never assume that an audience will accept mere data as justification for a claim. In every case, you must make your reasoning explicit, and you must warrant a conclusion. For example, in 1935, Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered a speech to the Young Democratic Clubs of America. In that speech, he offers the following argument:

[Grounds] The rules that governed the relationship between an employer and employee in the blacksmith's shop in the days of Washington cannot, of necessity, govern the relationship between the fifty thousand employees of a great corporation and the infinitely complex and diffused ownership of the corporation.

[Warrant] If fifty thousand employees spoke with fifty thousand voices, there would be a modern Tower of Babel.

[Claim] That is why we insist on their right to choose their representatives to bargain collectively in their behalf with their employer. (Lawler & Schaffer, 111)

Roosevelt's reasoning is clarified in the second sentence before making his final claim. Without that warrant, the movement to the claim would seem awkward (at best) and confusing (at least). Every proof, reason, contention, or justification that you offer to defend or negate a resolution must be explicitly linked to the resolution through a warrant.

Grounds, Claims, and Warrants

Grounds in L-D does not refer, generally speaking, to empirical proof. Grounds refers to what David Zarefsky calls "rhetorical proof," materials which support but do not guarantee a conclusion (187). Unlike science, which tries to demonstrate a hypothesis through mathematical proof or formal logic, arguments based on persuasion and values are dependent upon the interaction between the speaker and the audience.

The *claim* can be thought of as the contention, argument, or justification at hand. The resolution itself is a claim.

Warrants are a bit more difficult to deal with. A "warrant" authorizes the reasoning that gets you from the grounds to the claim. The warrant provides the explicit persuasive link between the proof and the contention, and later between the contention and

the resolution. It is perhaps easier to ask the questions, "What warrants that statement?" or "Is the claim warranted?"

Warrancy is especially important in value debate. When linked to a proposition of value (a value premise), warrants tap into "our motives as human beings, as members of our culture, or as unique individuals" (Campbell, 197).

David L. Vancil, one of my favorite writers on the structure of arguments, frames warrancy in the following way:

"Brush your teeth," the mother says, "or they will turn black and fall out."

"So what?" says the child. "I don't want my teeth." (171)

Apparently, the mother and child reason and value differently because they have different warrants. Turning black and falling out means little to the child if the teeth themselves are unwarranted.

In terms of your actual debate practice, some suggested guidelines for case writing and for refutation follow on the next page. Each of the guidelines were developed by David L. Vancil and are described in much more detail in his book, *Rhetoric and Argumentation.*

References:

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. *The Rhetorical Act.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1982.

Foss, Sonja K., Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trapp. *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1985.

Golden, James L., Goodwin F. Bergquist, and William E. Coleman. *The Rhetoric of Western Thought.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1989.

Lawler, Peter Augustine and Robert Martin Schaffer. *American Political Rhetoric.* Savage, MD: Bowman and Littlefield, 1990.

Vancil, David L. *Rhetoric and Argumentation.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1993.

Zarefsky, David. *Public Speaking: Strategies for Success.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1996.

Testing Value Arguments

Tests of Value Premises

(Vancil, 171-177)

1) So what?
-Is there anything really harmful or beneficial about the situation as described?
-Who or what is really hurt?
-Is the alleged benefit really "good?"
-Is there actually an evil in this state of affairs?
2) Values Comparison
"This test reminds us that in the real world, things are seldom so simple that only one value is important in an argument."
(Vancil, 174)
-Are there more important things to think about?
-Are there situations where a lofty value can be subordinate to another?
3) Value Application
-Is the value being correctly applied or interpreted?
-Is the interpretation reasonable given the case?
Is the resolution warranted? When the competing subjects of evaluation in a resolution are defined clearly, each of these tests can be answered by providing a specific warrant which links your arguments to the resolutional claim.

Argument Tests

(Vancil, 102)

In constructing "good reasons," it is essential that you apply a few general tests for each argument.
1) Are the reasons true or acceptable? (validity)
2) Are the good reasons properly related to the claim? (relevance)
3) Are the good reasons sufficient to establish the claim? To what degree do the reasons warrant the claim? (significance)
Is the argument warranted? Every reason or claim which you offer in support of a resolution must be valid, relevant, and significant. If a claim fails to meet one of these criteria, then the claim will be unwarranted, and easy prey for an opposing debater.

Evidence/Proof Tests

(Vancil, 177-201)

1) How well does the evidence support the claim?
2) Is the proof an assertion? Is the source expert? Is the source biased?
3) Is the proof relevant? Sufficient? Consistent? Is the proof contextualized (does it have anything to do with the claim at hand)?

Is the proof warranted? For example, it is not enough to cite John Locke in your case. Make it clear to your audience why John Locke is particularly appropriate to address the subject. Provide the explicit link between the source and the subject (an authority warrant).

Source:

Vancil, David L. *Rhetoric and Argumentation.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1993.

Argumentation

Definition of ARGUMENT:

Claim or proposition which persuades an audience through logical reasoning supported by facts, examples, data, rhetorical proof, or other kinds of evidence.

Attributes of argument:

1) Criteria/substance - reasons and evidence, grounding, reasoning.

2) Analytic/opposition- mutually incompatible or mutually exclusive positions. Mutually incompatible is preferable. "Exclusive" denotes "all or nothing."

> Argument achieves:
>
> 1) capitulation
> 2) compromise
> 3) consensus
> 4) tolerance
> 5) antagonism

3) Self risk- Contractual relationship. People admit that they can change as a result of argument.

4) Presumption/burden of proof- Things exist and will continue to exist until someone gives a persuasive argument to change them. In value arguments, both sides must assume presumption in order to be persuasive.

5) Overlapping beliefs/values- Must achieve agreement on a claim via supports and warrants which are valid and universally accepted by the audience.

Adapted from: Cherwitz, 1991

Persuasion

Dialogue exists on four levels, which are hierarchical and dependent on the lower forms:

1) Instructing- Consists of telling how something is. It is impersonal. It is a means oriented act. There is causality between means and ends. Instructions can be true or false.

2) Advising- Highly personal. Subjects ought to consider making something the case. Predictability decresaes. Means or ends centered.

3) Arguing- Reconsider something. A corrective activity. Assumes that the other is misguided. Reason giving. Relationship between parties is assumed to be equal.

4) Persuasion- Cause the audience to believe in a certain way.

Persuasion is dependent upon yet transcends argumentation.

Frances Bacon argues that persuasion is based on five characteristics of human perception:

      1) Understanding (reason)

      2) Imagination (poetry)

      3) Memory (history)

      4) Passions (psychology)

      5) Will (human action)

Arguments and Persuasion

Whether our argument concerns public affairs or some other subject we must know some, if not all, of the facts about the subject on which we are to speak and argue. Otherwise, we can have no materials out of which to construct arguments.

-Aristotle

Definition of ARGUMENT:

Claim or proposition which persuades an audience through logical reasoning supported by facts, examples, data, rhetorical proof, or other kinds of evidence.

Arguments vs. Assertions:

FORMAL ARGUMENTS differ from ASSERTIONS based on likes and dislikes or personal opinion. Arguments rest on evidence that can be brought forth to prove or disprove (in rhetorical terms) the thesis in question.

Arguments and Persuasion:

Argumentation is a rational appeal to the understanding, and builds its case on a network of logical connections.

Persuasion adds the elements of emotional need and values to move the audience. To construct sound arguments is not necessarily to be persuasive. Arguments become persuasive when they are infused with RHETORIC.

RHETORIC:

"Rhetoric" is the use of the available means of persuasion, based on the three appeals of ethos, pathos, and logos (Aristotle).

>   *ethos*: appeal of credibility, sincerity

>   *pathos*: appeal to emotional needs (*pathetic, pathological*)

>   *logos*: appeal to logical needs

Argumentation is based primarily on *logos*. Pure argumentation is only a starting point. It is not enough. To be effective, your argumentation must be elevated to the level of *rhetoric*.

To achieve rhetoric, your arguments must have a unique and singular purpose:

>   PURPOSE: to persuade an audience to accept the validity or probability of an idea, proposition, or claim.

Reasoning

There are three major types of reasoning which allow a *rhetor* to be effective.

> 1) **INDUCTION** reasoning - specific examples infer general principles

> 2) **DEDUCTION** reasoning - general principles infer the validity of specific cases

Inductive reasoning builds the rules of evaluation and application. Deductive reasoning applies those rules.

> 3) **FICTIONAL** reasoning - "Myth, religious allegory, metaphor, aphorisms, indeed the world of legal fictions and analogy are examples of fictions we use in everyday reasoning. Fictional reasoning is the basis of the most powerful arguments." (Gerry Spence, *How to Argue and Win Everytime*, p114)

To demonstrate reasoning, we often employ "syllogisms," formulas which determine whether a claim follows reasonably from its premises.

A syllogism: a. Socrates is a man
                  b. All men are mortal
                  Δ Socrates is mortal

Syllogisms work on the basis of deduction— general principles infer the validity of specific cases. A syllogism only works when it abides by the "**containment principle**."

> **CONTAINMENT PRINCIPLE** - Whatever is said in a deductive conclusion must be contained in the premises.

For example, would it not be absurd to claim the following:

> a. Agnes is a woman
> b. All men are egotistical
> Δ Agnes is wonderful

The conclusion is based upon data not found in the premises. As a result, the conclusion is wrong. This is called an "**error in syllogism**."

Another kind of error in syllogism occurs when the premises are just plain invalid, as in:

> a. All reptiles are dictators
> b. Saddam Hussein is a reptile
> Δ Saddam Hussein is a dictator

The final error in syllogism occurs when one of the premises can be demonstrated to be flawed, as in the following example:

> a. All dictators are reptiles
> b. Saddam Hussein is a dictator
> Δ Saddam Hussein is a reptile

This is an error in syllogism because the term "reptiles" has a distinct biological meaning. The comparison, however, is a valid one. The metaphor of the reptile brings about a particularly nasty image, one which may be appropriate for the person in question.

The point: Evaluative claims do not have to be logically valid to be rhetorically valid. The second syllogism becomes valid when speaker and audience share the fictional basis for the comparison (fictional reasoning).

VALUES ARE NOT BASED WHOLLY ON LOGICAL PREMISES. THAT IS WHY ARGUMENTS, TO BE PERSUASIVE, MUST BE BOTH LOGICALLY AND RHETORICALLY STRONG.

Argumentative Anatomy

1) CLAIM
2) SUPPORTING MATERIAL
3) REASONING/WARRANT

I. Kinds of Claims

A) Factual - Empirically verifiable claims (e.g. "Prices of generic drugs are well below those of leading brands.")

B) Causal - Verifiable causation claims (e.g. "Sex differences cause differences in mathematical ability.")

C) Policy - Specific actions should be taken (e.g. "Automobiles should not be allowed in Yellowstone Park.")

D) Value - Evaluative claims (e.g. "Affirmative action is morally justifiable.")

Factual claims define and draw distinctions. Factual claims are often disputed because there is a lack of consensus as to what "factual" terms mean. For example, can you define "life" and "death?" If we could agree on those definitions, there would be little controversy over abortion.

Note: Be able to distinguish between statements of fact and statements of opinion.

Causal claims identify possible causes for a given effect or possible effects for a given cause. Causal claims postulate that two events do not merely occur or appear together, but are in fact causally related.

Policy claims make recommendations about specific actions. They establish that a problem exists and is serious enough to merit solving, and then offer specific solutions for the problem.

Value claims make judgements. Value arguments apply ethical, moral, aesthetic, and utilitarian standards to produce judgments that measure a subject against the ideal.

Arguments which evaluate must:

1) Provide sufficient and verifiable demonstration of a phenomenon.

2) Provide appropriate standards by which to measure value in contingent circumstances.

NOTE: Claims are interrelated. Factual claims often determine the validity of causal claims. Evaluative claims often determine the suitability of policy claims. The implications of specific policies often determine evaluation.

II. Support and Proof

Value claims can not be proven empirically, because there is no factual basis for validity. If they could be proven empirically, there would be no point in debating them.

In addressing competing value claims, however, it is appropriate to speak of RHETORICAL PROOF, that body of support which furthers the persuasive aim. Rhetorical proof functions at the various levels of ethos, pathos, and logos.

KINDS OF RHETORICAL PROOF:

1) Evidence - empirical proof (examples or empirical data which suggest or imply an evaluation)

    a) personal experience ("The other day...")
    b) hypothetical cases ("Suppose...")
    c) expert testimony (Someone who is 1) an expert/authority in the field; 2) free from bias; 3) timely/relevant, not out of date)
    d) statistical data

2) Proofs - qualitative proof (examples which make evaluative claims)

    a) analogies (Allegory of the cave)
    b) literary parallels

     c) historical events
     d) philosophical claims
     e) theoretical claims
     f) abstract parallels

III. Warrants

To say that something is "warranted" or "unwarranted" is to claim that ways of connecting propositions with evidence/ support are or are not legitimate. All claims are based on warrants or underlying assumptions. Persuasive arguments require that the speaker and audience share or come to share the same underlying principles. Warrants validate the relationship between a claim and its support.

If the warrant is sufficient, i.e. the proof is relevant, then the speaker is authorized to move from the evidence of specific examples to a general conclusion (inductive reasoning).

Examples of warrants:

     LAW - principles, statutes, licenses, permits

     SCIENCE - scientific laws, formulas, methods

     MEDICINE - practices confirmed by experience

TYPES OF WARRANTS

     EXPLICIT WARRANTS - Establish rules, guidelines, and boundaries; explcit warrants demonstrate reasoning.

     IMPLICIT WARRANTS - Tap into shared assumptions and beliefs; implicit warrants assume agreement.

The failure of an argument to persuade is often the result of an erroneous taking-for-granted of shared views (implicit warrants).

     1) Generalization - authorizes movement from a number of specific examples to a generalization offered as a conclusion

     2) Cause/Effect - if a particular cause is observed, a particular effect can be expected to follow ("where there is smoke, there is fire")

     3) Sign - points to an indicator or sign that a certain event, condition, or situation exists (a large house might signify wealth)

     4) Analogy - there are sufficient similarities between two things to warrant that what is true of one can reasonably be expected to be true of the other

     5) Authority - the authority cited is in fact qualified to express an expert opinion on the subject of the claim

     6) Value - moral or ethical principles or beliefs held commonly by speaker/persuader and audience validate the claim

WARRANT TESTS

1) Reliability - Does the warrant express a reliable generalization?

2) Application - Does the generalization authorize the connection between proof and induction?

Applied Argumentative Anatomy

An argument is a proposition which persuades an audience with logical reasoning supported by some form of evidence. The validity of an argument is not determined by opinions or by rhetoric, but by a rational appeal to understanding. A truly great debater will construct a logical argument and present it in a persuasive manner (logos, pathos, ethos), but for now we will focus solely on the logical construction of an argument.

Parts of an Argument

Recall that there are three components to a complete argument: (1) claim, (2) support, and (3) warrant

I. Claim

The claim establishes the point that the debater wants to prove. Generally there are four types:

A) Factual- Attempt to define things "as they are;" the main point of conflict is usually over what is or is not considered "factual" (Ex: The American public favors gun control; Public executions are more expensive the cost of keeping a prisoner alive for forty years.)

B) Causal- Attempt to link certain events in a cause/ effect relationship (Ex: Reagenomics caused the 1982 recession; censorship of musical lyrics will lead to totalitarianism.)

C) Value- Attempt to produce value standards based on a variety of moral and ethical principles (Ex: Gay marriages are morally justified; Liberty is of greater importance than domestic security.)

D) Policy- Attempt to demonstrate that a certain problem is significant and can be solved by a specific method. These claims are extremely rare, but they can apply to LD in certain circumstances (Ex: A 11:00 PM curfew is needed to reduce juvenile crime)

Obviously, value claims are the most frequent in LD, but factual and causal claims are found in almost every case. Claims are typically stated as contentions or subpoints

II. Support

After making a claim, a debater must provide some form of proof that the claim is valid. By their very definition, value claims cannot be proven absolutely; nevertheless, one must provide a rational basis for supporting certain values. Sample types of evidence include:

A) Personal Examples (We all remember how gas prices rose during the War...)

B) Analogies (Liberty is like a house...)

C) Expert Testimony (Dr. Ronald Stephens from Yale argued in ...)

D) Reports (The April 15, 1996 NYT points out that 50,000 troops...)

E) Statistics (73% of Americans favor term limits...)

The most effective arguments are those which contain a balance of philosophical and pragmatic supports. For example:

Contention 1: Affirmative Action is justified because it protects the least advantaged members of society. The proper role for the American government has been hotly debated for the last 200 years, but I would argue that the government's first priority should be to ensure equality of opportunity to those who have the fewest resources in society. As philosopher John Rawls explained in his 1971 book A Theory of Justice, ... Rawls is certainly correct; after all, a government which refuses to address inequalities will merely promote an unjust aristocracy of the rich.

Since affirmative action is targeted towards women and minorities, we must now determine if these groups are indeed disadvantaged. With the May 24, 1996 issue of The Wall Street Journal reporting that the unemployment rate among racial minorities is more than 6 times higher than that for whites...

III. Warrants

The warrant is easily the most important aspect of any argument. The warrant is an explanation of how the support relates to the claim. Warrants can be anything from a detailed analysis to a simple reference to implied values, and they may be based on deductive or inductive reasoning. Regardless of the method chosen, a debater must link the claim and the evidence in such a way that the *audience* understands the connection. The following are common warrants:

1) **Authority**- This warrant asserts that the evidence presented proves the claim true because the source of the evidence is worthy of trust.

> Considering that the President's Safety Commission, which has been studying the use of handguns in this country for more than 40 years, recommended in a June, 1996 report that handguns be restricted to prevent further accidents, there can be little doubt that gun control measures must be strengthened.

To attack such a warrant, one must challenge the credibility of the source (The PFC is biased, their studies were incomplete/ flawed, equally valid organizations disagree, the PFC has been wrong in the past, etc.). Typical Authority Warrants: the President, the Supreme Court, Policy Experts, Philosophers

2) **Generalization**- This warrant assumes that a general principle can be derived from a series of examples or case studies.

> History has shown that it was the passivity of world leaders that allowed Hitler to destroy Europe, Pol Pot to ravage Cambodia, and the continuing civil war in Nigeria. Clearly, the U.S. must get involved in Yugoslavia now to prevent history from repeating itself.

To attack this warrant, one should question the sample is representative of an entire group or if there is any similarity among the examples (These situations were all different, Bosnia is not like these conflicts, passivity was good in most cases, etc.). Typical Generalization Warrants: Historical Examples, Polls/Statistics

3) **Sign**- This warrant points to one or more events as an indicator of a certain condition in society.

> Anyone who thinks racism is over in America is sadly mistaken. One need only turn on the evening news and see reports of black church bombings to see that racism is becoming more common and more violent.

Sign warrants can be proven invalid simply by showing that the event does not necessarily imply a broader trend (These bombings could be the work of a few demented individuals, and do not mean that racism is growing stronger across the community)

4) **Cause and Effect**- this warrant uses the evidence to show that one condition causes another.

> Clinical testing of more than 1,000 death row inmates since 1981 shows that only 23% ever attended college, and fewer than 11% graduated. Clearly, possession of a college education is critical for preventing future violent crimes.

This type of warrant is subject to many criticisms. One can show that there is an alternative cause, that the events are a mere correlation, or that the study is insufficient. (Many criminals are also poor or victims of abuse, lack of education does not "cause" crimes (janitors, etc.))

5) **Comparison**- This warrant claims that what is true in one case must be true in another.

The American colonists were justified when they revolted against Britain; likewise, we supported the first states to break away from the Soviet Union. Therefore, we must support the Montana Freemens decision to break away from the U.S.

This warrant is defeated simply by showing that the situations described are as different as possible (Ex: Britain and the U.S.S.R. were oppressive, the U.S. is not, etc.)

6) **Analogy**- This warrant uses a resemblance of two dissimilar things to make a point.

> If you add white cream to black coffee, what happens? The coffee becomes weaker. Likewise, integrating whites and blacks only makes the two cultures weaker.

This argument is disproved by showing that the analogy doesn't describe the real world or that the analogy is too simplistic (Ex: weaker coffee tastes better, this is ridiculous!)

7) **Value**- This warrant appeals to an ethical a moral belief which the debater assumes the audience will share.

> Human life is the most important value we share. Assisted suicide allows anyone to degrade this value, so it cannot be allowed.

You can defeat this warrant with simple value argumentation- either prove that the value is not supported by the argument or that the value is not the most important. (Ex: Assisted suicide preserves quality of life, which is more important than sanctity of life)

Summarized and adapted from: Stuart Hirsch-berg's *Strategies of Argument* (Allyn & Bacon, 1996)

Logical Fallacies

Begging the Question (Circular Reasoning)- This fallacy occurs when the proof for a certain claim is merely a rewording of the claim itself. (Ex: In today's round we must value social welfare above all other values, for society is the most important thing we have.)

Charged Language- Occurs when a debater attempts to evoke an emotional response by using familiar, yet meaningless clichés (Ex: bleeding heart liberal, government propaganda, Washington insider, communist!)

Red Herring- An issue that has nothing to do with the issue at hand. Many debaters offer red herrings as a way of luring their opponents into wasting time. (Ex: In a debate over term limits, one debater might argue that communism is superior to democracy, which is irrelevant...)

False Analogy (Non Sequiter)- Occurs when the evidence used to support a claim has nothing to do with the claim itself (Ex: Marijuana should be legalized; after all, we allow people to smoke tobacco!)

Straw Man- This happens when a debater misconstrues his opponents words and attacks an argument that was never made; usually, this "straw man" argument is quite weak. (Ex: Debater 1: "While Hitler was an evil man, his early economic reforms were quite effective at reducing German inflation." Debater 2: "How can you vote for someone who says Hitler was an 'effective' leader?")

Ad Hominem- Rather than attacking the argument, the debater attacks the person who made it. (Ex: Foucault's entire notion of 'biopower' must be thrown out; after all, he was a homosexual!)

Argument from Ignorance- Occurs when a debater makes an argument about a subject of which little is known, and then assumes that since his argument cannot be disproved, it must be true. (Ex: My opponent admits that no one can deny the existence of UFOs; therefore, there must be intelligent life elsewhere in the universe.)

Appeal to the People- Assumes that since many people believe something, it must be true or just. (Ex: Over 150 million Americans own a handgun, so clearly gun control would be an unjust invasion of their private lives)

False Dichotomy- Presents two alternatives as if they were the only possible options. (Ex: Either we must destroy our current arsenal of nuclear weapons or millions will die!)

Hasty Generalization- A debater makes a deductive conclusion based on insufficient examples. (Ex: Today's news notes that the police arrested 7 people in Atlanta for falsifying welfare reports; clearly, the welfare system has gone out of control)

Sweeping Generalization- Opposite of a hasty generalization; assumes that there are no exceptions to a commonly accepted premise. (Ex- Everyone knows that killing is wrong; therefore, euthanasia is immoral)

Slippery Slope- Assumes that if one event occurs, a series of other event will follow. (Ex: Today we allow gay marriages; then people start accepting homosexuality; then all of our children will start turning gay!)

Post Hoc- This is simply faulty causal analysis- Beware! (Ex: Since the crime rate has risen since the inception of the FBI, the FBI is a worthless crime-fighting tool)

Naturalistic Fallacy- Occurs when debaters blur the distinction between what *is* and what *ought to be*. (Ex: The Constitution says we have the right to free speech; therefore, it must be protected at all costs.)

The Vocabulary of Values

The "**Essentialization**" paradigm: Essentializing interpretations of value issues select a single factor out of a cluster and view other issues in relation to it. Often, a value position is seen as appropriate because it is **instrumental** in the attainment of a single value laden concept or value form (e.g. "This resolution is valid [essentially] because it extends out of our desire to preserve human dignity.")

The "**Proportionalization**" paradigm: Proportionalizing interpretations stress the *inter*relationships among several ingredients and observe the proportion they bear to one another within the whole (e.g. "This resolution is valid for several reasons which, in proportion, demonstrate its worth.) Proportional arguments treat the subjects of evaluation as end states, or terminal values, and construct criterial systems in defense of those end-states.

VALUE SYSTEMS: enduring organizations of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance. (Milton Rokeach, *The Nature of Human Values*. MacMillan Free Press:1973)

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES: concern modes of conduct or the means for fulfilling other values. (Rokeach)

TERMINAL VALUES: concern desirable end-states of existence. (Rokeach)

VALUE REDISTRIBUTION: process in which a value becomes more and more widely diffused throughout a society until virtually all its members adhere to it. (Nicholas Rescher, *Introduction to Value Theory*. Prentice-Hall:1969)

VALUE EMPHASIS: values move upward in a value hierarchy. (Rescher)

VALUE DEEMPHASIS: values move downward in a value hierarchy. (Rescher)

VALUE RESTANDARDIZATION: process in which standards used to measure whether a value is being met increase or decrease. (Rescher)

VALUE HIERARCHIES:

> 1) *quantity* - whatever produces the greatest good for the largest number of people at the least cost is preferred (*Utilitarianism* is a **quantity** hierarchy)

> 2) *quality* - values what is unique, irreparable, or original

> 3) the *existent* - values the concrete or assured over the possible

> 4) *essence* - values what is at the core of a group or class rather than what is on the finges

> 5) the *person* - values the dignity and autonomy of the person over all competing values

> (Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame Press: 1969)

Criteria for Evaluation

1. Generally, terminal values should be viewed as more significant and important than instrumental values. (This is also called the "ends-means" distinction.)

2. When choosing between competing instrumental values (that is, choosing the most effective means to an end), the value that best meets the particular needs of the situation should be preferred.

3. In choosing one value over others, one should consider the hierarchies of quantity, quality, the existent, essence and the person if they are applicable to a particular choice or course of action.

4. The results of Rokeach's value survey of terminal values indicate a rather stable value system that is accepted by the American public and that can be used to support value preferences.

5. Values are not entirely fixed, however. Because values tend to change slowly, the advocate should consider the possibilities of value redistribution, value emphasis, and value restandardization as described by Rescher. (Barbara Warnick and Edward S. Inch, *Critical Thinking and Communication: The Uses of Reason in Argument.* Macmillan: 1994)

Criteria for Validity

1. Truth: Regardless of the category (social, political, ethical, or empirical, among others), an object of knowledge must be perceived as true. Even "ought" statements are employed with the belief that they are either true or false. Disputes over truth often arise from differences in perspective.

2. Belief: If one is to have knowledge about something, that something must not only be the case, but must be considered to be the case.

3. Justification: Anyone who attains knowledge does so on the basis of sufficient evidence or reasoning. (Richard Cherwitz and James Hikins, "Toward a Rhetorical Epistemology.")

Being **valid** does not necessarily mean being true or false in an empirical sense, but instead true or false in a rhetorical sense. Valid evaluations make statements about some aspect of the world— they are knowledge claims, which may be true or false just as history itself may be true or false (from an empirical perspective), but valid nonetheless (because 1) considered true, 2) believed to be accurate, and 3) justifiable by evidence and/or reasoning).

About the Authors

Martin "Randy" Cox is the Director of Forensics at Milton Academy in Milton, MA, and is the former Co-director of Individual Events at the University of Texas at Austin. He is a former NFL national Congress finalist and collegiate national champion, and his students have been graced with seven individual national championships and the overall team championships bestowed by the American Forensic Association, the National Catholic Forensic League, and the National Forensic League. He has served as the Chair of the New England District of the NFL and as President of the Massachusetts Forensic League, and also serves as Curriculum Director for Lincoln-Douglas Debate at the University of Texas National Institutes in Forensics.

Matthew Whitley is a seven time national champion, and his many titles include the NFL Lincoln-Douglas Debate title of 1992. Matthew has served as a coach of the University of Texas Individual Events Team, as well as Curriculum Director of the University of Texas Lincoln-Douglas Debate programs at the National Institute in Forensics. Matthew is currently preparing for graduate study in law.