

**LINCOLN DOUGLAS
DEBATE**

FOR
DUMMIES[®]

A GUIDE TO SURVIVING YOUR FIRST YEAR IN
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

Welcome to Debate.....	2
Basics.....	3
The Events	
What is Debate?	
Affirming and Negating?	
Basic Argument/Contentions.....	4
Claim	
Warrant	
Why?	
The Empiric	
The Card	
Impact.....	5
The Flow.....	5
Public Forum Debate.....	6
Introduction.....	7
What's really going on?	
Times	
The Flow.....	8
Case Structure.....	9
Definitions	
Warrants	
Impacts	
Affirming	
What it means to affirm?	
Contentions	
Negating.....	10
What it means to negate?	
Contentions	
Rebuttals	
1 st Rebuttal	
Summaries	
Final Focus	
Cross Fire.....	11
First Question	
Behavior	
What happens when you don't know?	
Partners	
Relationship	
Duties	
Late Nights as Starbucks.....	12
Sample PFD case.....	13
Lincoln Douglas Debate.....	19
Introduction.....	20
Values Debate?	
Times	
The flow.....	21
Sample Topics.....	23
Case Structure.....	24

Definitions	
Setting Framework	
Affirming	
The Constructive	
First Affirmative Rebuttal.....	25
Extending	
Cross application.....	26
Weighing	
Overviews	
Second Affirmative Rebuttal.....	27
Voting Issues	
Crystallize/Writing the ballot	
Negating	
The Constructive	
First Negative Rebuttal	
Second Negative Rebuttal	
Cross Examination.....	28
Responding	
Questioning	
Theory.....	28
Topicality	
Spread.....	31
Speed	
Word Economy	
Judge adaptation.....	31
Sample LD case.....	33
Appendix.....	36
Research.....	37
Materials.....	39
How to Dress	
The Big Ones (and the not so big one)	
Resources.....	40
The Mindset	

Dear Novice or former speechie,

Welcome to the dark side of forensics; also know as debate. My name is Stephanie Ramones and I was Braddock's first hardcore, never did interp, debater. I competed primarily in Lincoln Douglas Debate, but I have a deep love for Public Forum debate, as it was first and my last event when I competed with Cesar Fernandez (the Student Congress guru). I'm here to teach you to be a debate rock star we all know you can be. If you need help on more advanced techniques tell Cecil to get a hold of me and we'll set something up. I also recommend attending one of many prestigious camps around the country. (Go NDF...shameless plug)

Good Luck!

Stephanie Ramones
Class of '07

The Basics

The Events

Forensics as you probably have already been introduced to, is basically divided into Interpretation events (Humorous Interpretation, Dramatic Interpretation, Duo Interpretation, and Oral Interpretation), Debate Events (Public Forum Debate, Lincoln Douglas Debate, and Policy Debate), and Speech Events (Domestic Extemp, International Extemp, Mixed Extemp, Oratory and Student Congress).

Interpretation Events ask you to interpret literature. Oral interpretation asks you to choose a poetry piece and a prose piece. HI, DI and Duo asks you to pick a play script that is performed with multiple characters.

Speech Events are a cross between performance events (Like Interp) and debate events. Oratory asks you to make a 10 minute speech on how fix a problem in the world, extemp gives you a topic 30 minutes prior to making a speech on it and Student Congress acts as a congress where students debate pieces of legislation.

What is Debate?

Debate is arguing intelligently. When you compete for the first time you will go to a schematic that says what room you are to go to, your opponent, the side you will be speaking on (In Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Policy the sides are assigned, in Public forum you normally flip a coin for a side and speaking order for the exception of the Catholic forensic league where you will also be assigned a side and the affirmative will always speak first.) and your judge(s). Your judge will normally be a former high school debater, a parent, a coach or a random college student. The judge is forced to make a decision between the two sides of who persuaded them more. They are asked to disregard the prior beliefs before the round (Not like all do, but it's the principal) and not to intervene, which means argue for the debater and are asked to decide solely based on the arguments said in the round. The point is that the judge is *forced to make a choice* between the two teams or people in the room and thus you must make more reasons why the judge should vote for you to have the win and less reasons for they to vote for your opponent.

Affirming/Negating

Affirming means that you agree with the resolution presented to it and thus you have to prove its validity. On the other hand, Negating means you oppose the resolution and you seek to disprove it. Negating has much more leeway no matter what the topic is and some topics can have arguments heavy on one side.

The Basic Argument/Contention

A contention is a fancy word for argument as often used by all debaters as a signal that they are making new point. A contention should comprise of the following:

1. Claim- the point you are trying to make i.e. Guns are bad
2. Warrant- *why* I believe your claim i.e. *Because* they are used kill people
3. Impact- WHY I CARE. (Probably the most important part because otherwise you're just wasting everyone's time) i.e. *you should affirm because* people will use guns to kill people and that would be bad since everyone sort of likes living.

The claim is normally just a sentence that describes what your argument is going to explain. It's how you start your contention in your speech. It should be fairly short and easy to take a note of. (Also known as a tag.)

The warrant is the big why of the contention. As a teenager (even as a respected college professor) you need to explain why I should believe you. There are many different ways to prove your point:

1. The Empiric: An empiric is something that is taken directly from real world observations. For example, controlled studies, historical patterns, and isolated examples. They take the form of either of statistics or an actual example. In public forum debate this is used to prove your point but in Lincoln-Douglas debate it's used more to disprove your opponent and the theories they're presenting. The reason that empirics don't always work too well is because they don't necessarily prove that something will happen again, which stems from the correlation not causation problem. Statistics normally just show to events correlate with one another which means that they happen side by side. They lack the power to show that the first event caused the second to happen. For example, the USA Today shows that as more coca cola is sold more deaths occur annually. This statistics doesn't necessarily show that Coca Cola caused the increase in deaths but just showed an odd coincidence. Examples also are isolated and don't necessarily show that it will happen again because there can be confounding variables. For example, Bobby took a sip of soda and died immediately. Once again this doesn't show that the sip of soda caused his death because logic says that we've seen plenty of other times where people have taken a sip of soda and haven't died right after. Also logic tells us that maybe something was wrong with the soda or Bobby had some condition that caused the untimely death. The only empirics that can somewhat prove causation is controlled studies because all other variables are eliminated. You want to look in the study for something called a p value, which is a value that shows the likelihood of the results occurring by chance. You want to look for a number below .05.
2. "The Card": A "card" is a cut citation from an author that explains why your claim is true. (Just if you wondering it's called card because back in the day policy debaters used to carry these citations on little index cards). You want to cut (edit) cards from authors that have a relatively good reputation and have been *peer-reviewed*; meaning that others in their field have read what they've said and say it's a legitimate conclusion. The card shouldn't be longer than a paragraph and should be cut so the most important parts are said clearly. You want to be careful and make sure that the card is representative of what the author believes and is arguing in his article or book. Here is an example of a card from the a LD case about violent revolutions in response to political oppression:

Dick James explains:

"The act of rebellion brings about a change in the status of the oppressed person, even when the person acts alone, the act makes him dangerous and hence deserving of a certain respect. It may open the prospect of escape from oppression. In concert with others, the act is doubly dangerous. Two thousand can join. Concerted action, armed or not, produces a strength that grows and May eventually cause a shift in the balance of power between oppressor and oppressed"

When writing your cases you want to include a footnote that cites where you get your empiric or card and why it works, just in case someone asks.

The impact, probably the most important part of the whole contention, explains why we listened to your contention. It tells the judge why this claim and warrant is a reason to pick your side as the most persuasive. I'll explain more about impacts when I go into specific styles.

The Flow

In debate you want to take notes in the most efficient and organized manner. You want to take notes by speech and side. *Flowing* is a matter of taking notes organized in speeches and side that keeps everyone in the round on the same page when you make your speech. This way you can clearly signpost (telling your judge where are you in the speech) who and what you're talking about. I'll get more into flowing with each particular event.

PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE

Introduction

What really goes on?

The National Forensics League (NFL) defines Public Forum Debate as:
“Public Forum Debate is audience friendly debate. You and a partner will debate controversial issues that are “stripped” from the newspaper headlines. A new topic will be announced the first day of each preceding month at www.nflonline.org. A Public Forum Debate round begins with a flip of a coin between the competing teams to determine your side and speaker position. Public Forum will test your skills in argumentation, cross-examination, and refutation.”

Basically, Public Forum is a two on two debate that is meant to be kept simple and appealing to all types of people. Resolutions are should statements that ask you prove the resolution true or false. For Example:

2007 Public Forum NATIONAL Tournament Topic

Resolved: That the private ownership of handguns should be banned in the United States.

2007 March Public Forum Topic

Resolved: That the quantity of credit available to American consumers should be significantly reduced.

2006 December Public Forum Topic

Resolved: Colleges and Universities in the United States should end their early admission programs.

Times: Each Debate must be timed to get us to shut up....

At first you will be striving just to use your full time but as your team gets more practice, your goal is to say as much substance in the time you have.

Team A 1st Speaker Constructive: 4 minutes
 Team B 1st Speaker Constructive: 4 minutes
 1st Crossfire between 1st Speakers: 3 minutes
 Team A 2nd Speaker Rebuttal: 4 minutes
 Team B 2nd Speaker Rebuttal: 4 minutes
 2nd Crossfire between 2nd Speakers: 3 minutes
 Team A 1st Speaker Summary: 2 minutes
 Team B 1st Speaker Summary: 2 minutes
 Grand Crossfire between all speakers: 3 minutes
 Team A 2nd Speaker Final Focus: 1 minute
 Team B 2nd Speaker Final Focus: 1 minute

Keep in mind at Catholic Forensics League (CFL) tournaments the sides are assigned before hand and the affirmative speaks first. At other tournaments there is a coin flip and the winner can pick the side or speaking order.

The Flow

SIDE _____	1 st spkr. (4 min.)	Cross (3 min.)	2 nd spkr. (4 min.)	Cross (3 min.)	Sum 1 st spkr (2 min.)	Grand Cross (3 min.)	Final Focus 1 st spkr. (1 min.)
SIDE _____	1 st spkr. (4 min.)	Cross (3 min.)	2 nd spkr. (4 min.)	Cross (3 min.)	Sum 1 st spkr (2 min.)	Grand Cross (3 min.)	Final Focus 1 st spkr. (1 min.)

Here's an example of a flow. I suggest to different color inks. As you can see you can this helps you "flow" cleanly from one speech to another and keeps you from mentioning something in one speech and forgetting to mention it in a later speech or bringing something up you never have brought up before in a late speech. You want to have constructive "pre-flowed" before entering the round so you don't have to write in your constructive.

Case Structure

The constructive should be fully written to the four minutes. You should also have both sides prepared. When making a constructive you want to make sure that you have a lot of offense (points in your favor) that you can use to win the round. It also helps a lot to load up on statistics (for some reason judges love them and they make you sound “well-researched”). You can’t just have statistics but also have arguments of substance that logically make sense as well and can be easily explained, you don’t want to explain 4 or 5 links to your impacts.

Definitions

Before you form your cases you need to understand what the resolution is about. You want to spend time defining key words and phrases. It’s not really necessary in your constructive speech but if you bring up a not so common term that is or isn’t in the resolution it would be good to define it.

Warrants

Empirics work best as warrants in Public forum just based on the topics they chose. Cards work well, but keep them short since the constructive speech is so short.

Impacts

Impacts in public forum become voting issues in the later speeches. In order words the reason why the argument and warrant you just presented is a reason to vote for your team. These need to be clear and short for the judge. You normally tag an impact by saying “This is important because...” or “You affirm/negate because...” Remember your arguments don’t matter if there is no impact. Your arguments must also be clearly for your side otherwise your opponents can use it against you.

Affirming

What is affirming?

When you affirm you are saying you are for the resolution and the change the resolution is asking. In PF it means that whatever the resolution is proposing *should* happen. Keep in mind this doesn’t mean you have to think up a way for the resolution to actually happen but just why it should.

Contentions

Your contentions should center on the idea of why the resolution happening is a good thing. You have to think about the effects of what would happen in the “affirmative world” meaning if the resolution already happened. You need to make this world the best world ever. Warrant your claims with anything that proves that affirming would cause these good effects. Also look for authors that agree with this action being taken. You are looking for 2 to 3 contentions. You can also divide your contentions into sub points which are just claims and warrants that fall under the big idea of the contention. (Basically, they are dependent on the contention and can’t really logically stand on their own.) Ideally all the sub points should be independently impacted to maximize the amount of offense.

Negating

What is negating?

When you negate you are rejecting the resolution. You are saying that nothing should be changed and everything should remain the same.

Contentions

Your contentions should center on that if the resolution were to be affirmed all these harms would come out of it. You could also take the position that affirming wouldn't fix any of the harms that the Affirmative is saying it would solve. You need to strive to disprove everything that the affirmative is saying. The negative has a lot more options when it comes to positions because you don't really have to defend anything; you just have to oppose the resolution. You could use the same structure described in the affirmative contentions. It's best to start writing the affirmative then the negative case.

Rebuttals*1st Rebuttal:*

The first rebuttal is the most time you will have to refute (argue against) your opponent's case. You want to always handle the big issues of your opponents' case first. (You can tell what these issues are by how much time they spend on it in their constructive and in the crossfire). You want to disprove any statistics they provide with counter statistics and you want to prove the reverse of all the impacts. What you are doing is *turning* their offense into your offense. This is when you turn one of their points into one of your points. You want to have as much prepared before you enter the round as you can. So it's good to have fact sheets and blocks (pre written responses to arguments) done. This way you can have well-constructed rebuttal.

If you are second speaker you also want to handle what was said against your case. You want to do this by minimizing anything they said. It's also important to point out that even though they have pointed out a counter statistics it doesn't necessarily prove them right. At this point you might want to question the validity of their sources. You also want to add additional warrants to support your point. If a point isn't that significant and your opponent has placed too many responses you should just drop it (not bring it up again).

Summaries

This speech is so you can summarize what has happened in the round thus far. This is a time where you show the judge that you've done a lot more to prove that your side is the one to vote for. You can take this time also to respond to any last minute response if they're pressing but you need to start narrowing down the big issues and what the round has focused on. This speech is important because you are now starting to find out what the voting issues are and you can start "crystallizing" for the judge, which means setting out the voting issues and defining the round so the judge can write what you said on their ballot for the reason why they voted for your side.

Final Focus

Sometimes known as the last shot, you are given a minute to pick out the big issues for your side to win. You only want to pick one major flaw of your opponent (only if it's a glaring big error, like dropping your whole case or how their whole case has no offense

or impacts). This speech is meant to focus the debate on your side and to remind the judge why your side wins.

Crossfire

This is probably the only time that the judge is going to see both teams react to each other and for a lay judge often decides the round. It's important to show your skills at debating here and make your opponent even doubt themselves.

Normally debaters sit during crossfire but NFL and some other leagues are asking that you stand and face the judge during the first two crossfires and sit for the Grand Crossfire.

First Question

The first question always goes to the first team that spoke. You should start with a question that would need you to follow up with another question, such as a clarification question. This way you gain more dominance in the crossfire. You want to also have more probing questions in your crossfire to make your opponent seem weaker and that their case has holes in them.

Behavior

As hard as it may be cross fire isn't a time to be a complete jerk. You want to remain as calm as you can and keep away from seeming antagonizing. You also want to stress out your opponent by seem completely calm because it makes it seem that they have more flaws to hide and also makes them seem weaker. If you are stuck responding to many questions and your opponent just doesn't let up, just calmly ask to ask a question, as it is a timed crossfire. If your opponents are being rude you need to remain calm throughout the crossfire, to show the judge your composure (I've had cases thrown at me, there are beyond rude people sometimes). You also don't want to ramble too long in your responses because it comes off as obnoxious. The goal is to have a quiet dominance in the crossfire.

What Happens when you don't know?

Stay Calm, if you don't know the answer to question try to deflect away from that by talking about something somewhat related and direct the crossfire away from the subject. It's very difficult to handle this situation but hopefully you can deflect away the damage.

Partners??

You want to find someone you can trust and that you get along with.

Relationships

You want to avoid the whole power struggle thing. You two are equals and each of you has your strengths. In my team, I was more used to direct debating and refuting on the spot and Cesar was an incredible speaker. We worked in a way that we complemented each other versus competing with each other. You have to know that you can work with each other and be willing to explain to each other arguments one of you may not understand. THIS IS A PARTNERSHIP not a competition.

Duties

There are two ways of dividing duties. The first, which I don't really recommend as it doesn't take full advantage of strengths, is one person to write the NEG and the other the AFF and what ever side you end up with the person that wrote the constructive reads it. This also doesn't work because this can lead to many arguments on which side your team feels more comfortable with and a lot of bruised egos. The plus is you somewhat equally share the work.

The second method is you assign the first speaker and second speaker and the first speaker writes both of the constructive and the second speaker does the research and writes blocks. In this method it's important to play on strengths (like Cesar and I) and be ready to contribute in both processes.

Late Nights at Starbucks

Cesar and I often met up at Starbucks to discuss cases. Even though he was in charge of writing cases and I blocks and research we never left each other out of what we were doing. It's important to be on the same page of your partner, other wise it will show. You also have to respect your partner enough to let them help you on your weaknesses. For example, I tended to get heated in cross fires and Cesar instead of yelling at me after the round would draw happy faces on my papers. (You can look through all my old PF papers there's a happy face on most of them.) Your partner is going to know you debate wise better than anyone and you have to let them help you and you have to be willing to help them. Your success doesn't necessarily depend on your partner but how both of you decide to work with each other. I promise if you work well you'll come out of it with a great friend and maybe a few trophies. 😊

Sample Case

The next few pages show a sample cases that Cesar wrote. Enjoy!

2006 December Public Forum Topic

Resolved: Colleges and Universities in the United States should end their early admission programs.

Aff. Annihilation

Because we agree with Harvard and Princeton's decision to remove their early admissions programs we affirm.

In the spirit of constructing our affirmative case, we must first clear up one of the greatest misconceptions on this topic, which pertains to the identification of the original intention of the creation of early admissions.

The Early Admissions Game: Joining the Elite, Christopher Avery, Andrew Fairbanks, and Richard Zechauser – Explain that the original intention of early admissions was to create a program that allowed students to find out earlier whether they got in to the colleges and universities of their choices. In essence, students would be less stressed. However the three go on to explain that a plethora of diehard competition just made it even harder for students because they now found themselves with that same pressure, just that the deadlines were sooner. Yet when analyzing the actual early admissions design we see that there is an inevitable benefit on the college's part with early admissions, and that is their ability to use it as a competition tool. Thus the reason why early admission programs proliferated to virtually every school was because of the fact that colleges did not want to be turned down on the student's selection process because of unique programs that other universities had. Hence we on the affirmative ask, if the original intention was to help the students, and the benefits on the college's parts were inevitable, then why upon proving that the students no longer benefit do colleges still have the program?

1: Early Admissions process is absolutely useless in coherence to the actual intention of their creation..

- **According to Collegeboard.com** amongst the many things that are scrutinized, never do you see applying early as a consideration to a school's decision to accept a person. In fact, Upenn, NYU, Columbia, Washington U, Boston U, Umiami, Berkley, Dartmouth, and each and every other school that college board provides the website's link all state that there is no benefits or increased chances of getting in to their respective schools by applying early.
- So because there is no difference within the selection process there is absolutely no benefits or advantages.
- Yet another point of view can be analyzed in seeing...
- **A Harvard Gazette Article dated September 12, 2006** explains Harvard's decision on why they got rid of their early admissions programs, in saying that there were no

benefits, however, disadvantages. Dean of Admissions William R. Fitzsimmons explains “Harvard intends to use the time and capacity freed up by the move to a single admissions cycle to focus more energetically on outreach and recruiting. Fitzsimmons and his admissions staff will travel more widely to make presentations in key cities and other areas to educate students, families, and college counselors about Harvard and the college admissions process more generally. The University will also work with secondary schools in a renewed effort to make applying to college less complicated and less stressful than it is today.”

- **Thus, because colleges have not removed their early admissions programs because of the competition aspects that still remain, it’s a trickled down effect, which will in essence lead to the steering away of the educational merit of going to colleges.**

Hence, when taking a step back and analyzing our reasons to affirm this far, Not only the fact that early admissions programs have shifted from their original good intentions can you affirm, but also the fact that early admissions programs have led to many negative consequences in the overall college admissions process.

2: *Early Admissions has many disadvantages*

A: *A significant amount of students are accepted early without even knowing the full pool of applicants*

- **According a Newsweek article dating to April 2006** states that college and universities on average accepts over 40% of their freshman class through early admissions programs. They are basically accepting a significant amount of their students without even knowing whom else is applying. This gives the students applying early admissions an unfair advantage as they are applying to a much smaller pool of applicants and increasing their chances of becoming accepted.
- Not only that but colleges do not necessarily always accept the best students, as those applying to their

regular decision programs suddenly just become class fillers and college and universities are forced to reject students that could have possibly been accepted in the early admissions pool and are truly the better applicants.

B: *The deferring process takes away the little advantage of knowing early and creates a large disadvantage for the applicants.*

Most compelling proof of a more accurate system can be found in a **New York Times Article dated May 20, 2006**. In which one of the results of removing early admissions for colleges and universities is the removal of the deferring process. The reason that this is important lies within the facts that if a student gets deferred he is automatically at a disadvantage by saying that the early decision applicants only have a half of a semesters worth of their senior year added to their applications. Whereas regular admission applicants have a full semester of their senior year, including possibly finished community service projects.

I: Overall you can see that both the applicants and students are at a disadvantage, as applicants are forced to apply early when their applications are at their full potential to gain an advantage and colleges do not get to fully compare the applicants and decide who would truly be the best students.

At the end of the day when analyzing effective policies or programs, one must consider those that their benefits outweigh their costs. It is because there are absolutely no benefits and countless disadvantages to early admission programs that we negate.

Neg. Nasty 5000

4,3,4,2,3,1

It is because there is no feasible way to enforce such diminishing actions to early admissions programs across the nation that we negate. When analyzing the realistic approaches to eradicating colleges and universities' own early admissions programs across the nation it is essential to realize that there are a plethora of limitations that stand in the way.

1. Removing Early Admission Programs will do absolutely nothing.

Within the resolution's title.... it clearly states that colleges will end their early admissions programs, this means their respective programs, thus, not necessarily the same program as each and every school. Regardless whether you affirm or negate there would be no change because the resolution doesn't speak of the creation of a mandate or even a universal deadline.

- According to **Collegeboard.com**, we can see that the deadline for regular admissions at Yale University is December 31, whereas the deadline for NYU, which are both private universities, is January 15. Now when we look at other private schools, College Board tells us that University of Miami's regular decision program ends February 1, whereas Boston University's regular decision is over January 1st.
- **As the University of Florida explains on their undergraduate admissions website** they have established 2 regular decision programs one on November 1, 2006, and the other on January 16, 2006.

Thus, we see that by eliminating early admissions your are simply eliminating a title, not necessarily earlier deadlines, this is because by removing their respective programs it still leaves any and all possibilities to set their admissions programs to whatever date they wish.

2. Removing Early Admissions programs would infringe upon the very reasons and ideals they were founded on.

A. Unlike popular belief, that early admissions were founded on the basis of providing an advantage or whatever, Early Admissions were actually started to produce efficiency by straining the dedicated students away from the original admissions pool, thus saving time.

- **John Echemendy, A Stanford University Provost** – explains, “There is nothing about early admissions, in itself, that gives an advantage to those who apply early. It all depends on whether the university imposes lower, the same or higher standards to the early pool. Nor can you infer the standards by simply comparing admission rates in the early and late pools.

-The admission rate is determined by two things: the standards applied and the qualifications of the applicants. If the early pool is, on average, more qualified, then applying precisely the same standard will result in a higher rate of acceptance.

MI: Moreover we see that if an advantage to affirming actually stands valid, there is nothing to say that it is due to possibilities of disadvantaged students. In fact, in this case, Mr. Echemendy explains that it is possible for early admission to just be a harder way for students to get in to college.

- Now that we eliminated the misconception on disadvantages we can now prove that early admissions promote efficiency.
- **Newsweek Article of April 2006**, explains the logic of efficiency when covering early admissions, by showing that because the work is divided amongst the admissions office by a series of months, there is less to be done all at once. This high scrutiny also plays the role in minimizing the error rate by making sure that the process has no delays. Thus colleges and universities can make legitimate decisions, ON TIME.

MI: If we remove early admissions programs we will have the mess of having each and every applicant in the same admissions pool. So unless the schools cough up the budget to improve the size of the admissions offices, in which we cannot prove, just hope -- affirming would be an epic mess.

B. Binding decision is inherently beneficial to both the colleges and the applicants in coherence to prioritizing the schools they most want to attend.

- According to the Princeton Review, binding decisions lock the students into the school, this is essential to truly evaluate their decision when applying to college. When analyzing the colleges and universities benefit, the Princeton Review tells us that colleges will have applicants that had the predominant intention of going to their school to actually choose this school. This is important because you will have students being accepted to schools that actually want to be there as opposed to those who are trying to get in for bonus points.

Because of that we diametrically oppose affirming.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Introduction

The NFL defines Lincoln Douglas debate:

“This popular style of debating features one person on each side. Propositions of value are debated with the emphasis on developing logical argumentation rather than an accumulation of information. You will learn values analysis, argumentation skills, sound and ethical uses of persuasion, and clear audience centered communication. You will have the opportunity to debate several topics during the school year.”

Values Debate?

Basically LD is values debate, which means you strive for an abstract and intangible goal of the resolution. Such as Justice and global welfare. We all know what it is supposed to be, but no one really knows what is truly just or fair but that doesn't keep us from attempting to get there. You want to define what your value is. At the end of the day LD comes down to a battle of values and whose is better or who gets to them better.

Times

Affirmative Constructive: 6 minutes

Affirmative Cross Examination (Negative asks questions to Affirmative): 3 minutes

Negative Constructive/1st Negative Rebuttal: 7 minutes

Negative Cross Examination (Affirmative asks questions to Negative): 3 minutes

1st Affirmative Rebuttal: 4 minutes

2nd Negative Rebuttal: 6 minutes

2nd Affirmative Rebuttal: 3 minutes

Prep Time: Normally 3 minute per debater but in some tournaments I've seen up to five along with flex prep, which means you can ask questions to your opponent while in prep.

In Lincoln-Douglas Debate the rounds are almost always pre assigned and you can expect to debate each side evenly at a tournament. Often in break rounds there is a coin flip for the side unless you had debated that person previously in the tournament then you would switch sides.

The Flow

In this case you would need two separate sheets of paper. One sheet of paper would be for the affirmative offense and the other for the negative offense. You will also need two different color pens for each side. I tend to flow in black for everything I say and red or some other color for my opponent. I do this because I type my pre flows and then paper clip them to the piece of paper of my flow. Here's an example of a flow.

Definitions:*Provide:*

To make available

Observation: should and implementation doesn't matter thus theoretical context*Health Care*

Preservation of well being...

Citizens:

A resident of a city or town, especially one entitled to vote and enjoy other privileges there.

Just:

Justice as Fairness: /Rawls

Government obligation:

/John Locke Social Contract

/Singer: life includes basic essentials

Value- altruistic justice**Negative Burden:** has to prove that maintaining only a privatized health care can benefit all of the citizens**Criterion-**preserving the sanctity of life**Thesis:** health care allows the government preserve the sanctity of life.**1st Contention:** Health Care is inherent to protection of life.**Sub point A:** Epidemics of disease is a threat on life**Warrant:** top 5 cause of loss of life is threat**Sub point B:** Health care is about life and is everyday**Warrant:** logic**Contention 2** Health care allows citizens to compete for social opportunities

NC	1AR	NR	2AR
<p>Observation: Look to better agent and just government looking to if it is best for their responsibilities</p>			
<p>Free-rider</p>			
<p>Should implies can</p>			
<p><u>Value-</u> Human Worth <i>Link:</i> Since we are considering what a just government would decide we must hold the value that is highest to them which is human worth</p>			
<p><i>/Locke</i> <u>Criterion-</u> maintaining individual autonomy Sole contention: privatized health care allows from better promotion of health and also allows for more individual autonomy</p>			
<p>Sub point a: Invisible Hand</p>			
<p>Sub point b: Allow them to choose for themselves what is in their self-interest</p>			

Notice that I use abbreviations (the / means a card normally when you flow by hand you write the author's name right on the slash and what the card says next to the slash) in order to not only save space but saves time while your flowing. People will not pause so you can take down a note. There's also another style of pre flowing is to pre write your *extensions* right onto the pre flow. We'll cover this style and how to write and flow them when we get to extensions.

Sample Topics

Notice that topics are released every other month unlike Public Forum, which has a new topic every month.

2007 Lincoln Financial Group/NFL L/D NATIONAL Tournament Debate Topic

Resolved: On balance, violent revolution is a just response to political oppression.

2006 September/October Lincoln Financial Group/NFL L/D Debate Topic

Resolved: A just government should provide health care to its citizens.

2007 January/February Lincoln Financial Group/NFL L/D Debate Topic

Resolved: The actions of corporations ought to be held to the same moral standards as the actions of individuals.

Case Structure

Definitions

Definitions of key terms and phrases of the resolution should be stated in the beginning of the Affirmative constructive. They should be unbiased and commonly known. The best sources for general words like “should” by a dictionary such as Merriam Webster’s or American Heritage Dictionary. You don’t need to read the source in your definitions, unlike public forum, just for time sake. For terms that are not so well known, the best definitions are from authors in the field of the resolution. On the negative you do not need to say definitions in your constructive, unless, the affirmative doesn’t provide a definition to a term important to your case or the affirmative definitions are biased. At that point you provide counter-definitions and explain why you have to. I’ll explain more about this later.

Setting Framework

As the affirmative (or even the negative) you need to provide framework for the round. This means you need to tell everyone in the room what it means the affirmative has to do and what the negative has to do to at least be a good affirmative or negative (some people say “this what the negative needs to do to win the round” but I think it’s not very strategic since maybe they can do that, so you want to make it sound like something they need to do before they even think of winning.), this is called a *burden* and is often made in arguments mixed into the definitions, before the definition, after but all before or mixed in the value structure. These can be called observations and are just arguments saying what the resolutions are about. These observations can also serve as *spikes*, which means a defensive argument hidden as framework. If you want to take out certain types of cases before they’re even said (particularly useful on the affirmative) you explain how they’re not truly affirming or negating, you are basically locking someone into a position so you can save yourself time in your rebuttals. You often use philosophy to set up your framework.

Affirming

The Constructive

The constructive should be written to take up the six minutes (around 1-3 contentions with sub points) and should include a framework with definitions, a value structure and your offensive contentions. The framework as already explained, begins with definitions and observations that explain what we are looking for in the round and then lead to a value structure.

The value structure begins with your Value Premise, the end goal of the resolution. I explained this earlier as just the value but now we need to create a distinction as we add another element into the mix. The value criterion is a weighing mechanism that tells the judge how you get to your value. This should be unbiased (you always want it to work a little more towards your side but not obviously slanted) and an action.

I.E. Value: Justice

Criterion: Protecting the basic right of life.

You always have to explain why your criterion is the best way to reach your value otherwise you face losing the round because your case will have to impact to your criterion as this is the way you show the judge how you win the value and round through it. Basically if you win your criterion and you impact to throughout the round, you should win the round.

In your arguments you use the basic structure except your warrants need to be more logic based and need to explain why something will happen. When writing your cases just imagine someone screaming out why every time you say something that has no because. You can't just assume everything because not everyone is thinking that it's as obvious as you think.

You also need to impact all your arguments three ways. First you impact it to the value criterion which means you impact to the value. Second, impact directly to the value. Lastly you impact to the resolution itself, this is sometimes called a pre-standard impact. (If you have a burden you should impact to the before the other impacts.)

First Affirmative Rebuttal

The first thing out of your mouth even before any of your rebuttals start (before time) is giving a *road map*, which just tells the judge where you're going in your speech. You have signpost where you are throughout the speech. Make it quick though.

You need to handle framework and value structures first. You want to make sure that the judge is looking towards your framework because you already have a case around it.

Debate it only if they're drastically different or just plain abusive. If they are basically the same just say their basically the same thing except for some rhetoric (word choice) and say no one is going to get any offense off it since you're just trying to make it easier for everyone in the round. It saves everyone major time. Keep in mind you're going to need to handle the framework in every speech.

You always want to begin your rebuttals (after handling values and such) by refuting the major issues of the negative case. You want to have pre written responses (known as blocks) and timed out so you can read them in less than 15 seconds. You want to have as many responses written as possible so the negative has no way of extending (I'll tell you what that means in minute) the argument through. You also want to *turn*, which means you make their offense yours. This is possibly the best thing you could do since not only are you taking out one of their argument you're also making an argument for yourself but you must make sure to impact it to a framework (preferably theirs if there isn't one general one for the round yet.)

Extending

The next thing you need to do after handling the negative cases is *extending* your arguments. This means that when your arguments haven't been handled properly, you answered the responses or they just dropped the argument then you need to make the argument again in each speech after. You need to signpost clearly and repeat a shortened (about 1/3 of the time you spent in your constructive) version of the contention or observation. You should pre write extensions to include the claim and warrant and the impact. You should also pre write these to make sure you keep a short time. Some debaters (including myself towards the end of the year) would pre write my extensions as my pre flow just so I didn't have to handle so much paper. The only thing is you want to make sure you know what part is claim, warrant and impact so when your opponent responds so you know what you can extend (keep in mind you and your opponent need to respond or turn most importantly to the warrant, claim, then the impact, only because once you turn the warrant it's very hard to scavenge the argument, the claim is slightly easier to scavenge the argument and impact they're are often many impacts and against popular belief are easy to "turn back". (Impact turns are very common and can be useful and often have to go hand in hand with another turn so it could be the most effective). You also don't want to say word for word any part of the argument except the claim or often referred to the tag (the general idea of the argument often just the claim).

Cross Application

Cross applying arguments is the best solution for when you're short on time. When handling your opponent's case you can make your framework arguments or contentions responses for the arguments they're making. You're extending the argument and at the same time making a response to their case. This technique is most effective when you cross apply your framework arguments to their case since you're saying what they're saying doesn't really matter since it's not fairly affirming or negating. You still need to extend the argument and handle the responses made against it when you get to your flow so the argument works to it's full potential, but you don't need to read the extension in it's entirety since you read it (just read the tag and the impact to your case at this point) already when cross applying just make sure to point out that you had just cross applied the argument previously.

Weighing

When you weigh arguments you are explaining why one is better than the other. You weigh most importantly impacts especially in turns. Here are ten basic weighing mechanisms.

- a. Magnitude
 - i. Number of people affected
 - ii. General size issues
- b. Qualitative
 - i. Saying it's bad or good
- c. Timeframe
 - i. Short term vs. Long term
 - ii. Preclusive arguments, require additional warrant
- d. Reversibility
 - i. The harm cannot be undone in the future
- e. Moral requirement
 - i. Ethical obligation to act a good/bad way
- f. Voluntary Risk
 - i. Harm with intent is worse
- g. Percent of total
 - i. Compares impact to worst possible impact
- h. Comparison of space and time
 - i. Only for the actor not the recipient of the action
- i. Conditional probability
 - i. Huge impacts of small risk
 - ii. Certain improbable links are require to reach the impact
- j. Institutional obligation
 - i. Some obligations are linked to institution

You need to warrant the weighing and impact it and you should explicitly say that this argument outweighs in one or more of the ways. This makes it easier for everyone in the room since it allows prioritization of the arguments.

Overviews

Since you have so much to do in such little time in this speech strategically it's better to place overviews or group similar arguments. When you begin the refutation of the negative case you want to point out general flaws of the case and that way in a way you've responded to the whole case. You want impact and

weigh overviews to be effective. If you can't necessarily place an overview on the top of the case then just try to group arguments as best as you can to save time. You have to signpost this clearly so everyone knows you're handling all the arguments. You should also go line by line after you've extended and debate the big issues of the case, but at least if you run out of time and don't handle some arguments it won't be as detrimental. The best overviews are when you cross apply a framework argument to the whole case.

Second Affirmative Rebuttal

This is a short speech so you only want handle framework, the negative voting issues and your own. This is basically the final word in the round and if done right explains to the judge why everything that has happened in the round thus far means they're affirming. NO NEW ARGUMENTS

Voting Issues

Voting issues should be the big issues of the round and you want to make them offense that you've extended and have been impacted clearly. You should pre write your contentions as 15 second voting issues consisting of the claim and the impacts as separate reasons to affirm. You should do the same thing for the turns. You should also write defensive voting issues which are just reasons why there's no way to vote negative. You can even make framework arguments voting issues (including the value and criterion) as they can be also used as defensive voting issues or as a way to take out their voting issues.

Crystallization/Writing the ballot

This is where you explain what has happened in the round, like whose framework you're using why that's important. You want to show who's impacting in what way and how the weighing is going. You also need to explain the "even ifs", this means that even if you don't win the standard or the framework that you still win. This where is it important that you've impacted to their standard or proved how they can't meet it (this is sometimes referred to as a criterion turn) before the last speech. You also want to number the voting issues and make sure they have tags so when the judge writes the reason for decision they can write exactly what you said in this speech. The whole point is to make the round crystal clear for the judge.

Negating

The Constructive

This seven-minute speech is both your constructive and your first negative rebuttal so your constructive can only be around 2 to 4 minutes long. (Around 1 to 2 contentions with sub points and a small framework with not contentions) You can still gain a lot of offense with the short constructive by turning affirmative arguments.

First Negative Rebuttal

It's best to handle the affirmative value structure while explaining yours. Use the same basic strategies explained in the affirmative rebuttals just with a negative scope.

Second Negative Rebuttal

This is your last word so not only do you have time to go over framework but you also have time to go over a line-by-line debate and tag voting issues along the way. You then, if you have time, go over a quick crystallization at the end of the speech.

Cross Examination

I put this section at the end even though it's my favorite part of the debate because unfortunately judges don't pay that much attention to it. If you make it interesting though you can earn major brownie points (Also known as speaker points) with your judge. You'll always be facing the judge during cross ex and never really look at your opponent.

Responding

You want to make sure that when you respond that you look as if you know your case and believe in it. Never answer yes to "If I do this will I win the round questions" It's a novice mistake to say yes, because if your opponent is asking this question to begin with they normally can do whatever they just asked. Avoid rustling through papers.

Occasionally debaters will "Call" your case, which means they ask to see. Normally this is just a strategic move to mess with you and see if you really know what you're talking about and they'll often quote you. If you're uncomfortable bring two copies just in case. Other times some people just doesn't understand your case or missed it. Bask in the silence if they're flowing it and if let them keep it and they'll normally give it back before your next speech if not ask. When calling the case make sure it's ok with your judge.

Questioning

In cross ex as the questioner you have the duty to move the debate forward so you need to ask probing questions, start off with easy clarification questions (only if you need them), but make sure that they lead to more probing questions. The more you can get your opponent to incriminate themselves you are basically just giving them rope to hang themselves. It makes you look like the better debater. Avoid being rude and let your opponent speak and if they ramble on politely egg them to move on.

Now that we've handled the basics here are some more advanced tactics used in Lincoln Douglas, most of which were taken from Policy Debate.

Theory

Theory is debating the rules of the event. Here is a theory shell that my friend Evan taught me theory with. It's known as a theory shell.

- A. Definition / Rule
 - a. This part depends on whether it's an abuse argument, a T violation, or any other kind of theory, so it can be rather diverse. Most basically, it's what they're not doing, and it can be very short. For instance:
 - b. "A. Definition: To provide means "**To equip** or fit out (a person, etc.) **with what is necessary for a certain purpose**" according to the Oxford English Dictionary"
 - c. "A. We shouldn't use gendered language in debate because entrenches patriarchy and attempts to cast gender into one of two states, normalizing transgender individuals."
 - d. "A. The framework for the debate should provide equal space for both debaters to argue their side of the resolution, allowing them to present logical arguments in an equal fashion"
- B. Violation
 - a. This is where you outline specifically where they violate the rule presented in A. It should be as clear as possible, pointing out specific

parts of their case or words they use. Most T violations have weak violations, and people get out of them with an easy “I meet” answer, so make this good, and if you hit it, make sure it’s good. For instance:

- b. “B. Violation: My opponent’s case relies on the existence of a private system for those who can afford it because the only benefits come from providing screening for people who don’t have it in the status quo. He has a specific spike in the AC that says his advocacy ends at giving those people that limited care. He fails to provide healthcare to his citizens because everyone who’s not getting the government vaccinations is getting them from private insurers, so the government specifically is not equipping them with what is necessary for the purpose of healthcare, increasing health and avoiding the harms of my opponent’s case.
- c. B. Violation: In the Locke card in the framework the word “man” is used repeatedly, connected conceptually to the right to property and autonomy. Especially given the context of Locke, a patriarchal society in which women had few rights and transgender individuals weren’t recognized at all, my opponent fails both prongs of the rule presented above.
- d. B: Violation: My opponent’s spike below should skew the equal division of ground for debate by preventing me from running cases related to implementation, but allowing him to run cases which fall prey to exactly the same problem. Increased health is a practical benefit of healthcare, not a theoretical one. My opponent’s case hinges on this implementation effectively delivering health to the end user. As such, he sets up a framework that fallaciously justifies his running certain cases but makes me unable to run the same.

C. Standards

- a. This is where you say why the rule is important, or why your definition is superior to the one presented in the AC. For instance:
- b. “C. Standards: First, my definition comes from the Oxford English Dictionary, which traces usage back to the 12th century in the interest of most closely approximating both common and literary use, which is superior the American Heritage Dictionary insofar as it tracks only the current meanings instead of grounding them in the past to provide context and depth. Also, it’s about a fifth the size, 70,000 entries compared to the OED’s 400,000. Second, in common usage we wouldn’t say that someone is providing something if the recipient is getting the service or good not from them but someone else, for example if you go to the store and buy chocolate, I am not providing it to you. Third, it’s important that we debate the topic because otherwise I can’t prepare for the round. If the affirmative can choose to affirm anything, it gives them infinite ground and correspondingly makes my research burden infinite because I’m expected to effectively argue against whatever they want to talk about. It’s preferable to debate the actual resolution because it’s fair, we can both walk into the round knowing what to expect and have a good debate. Fairness is important blah blah see (d)
- c. “C. Standards: It’s important that we avoid gendered language because the language we use is important in shaping our associations between gender and power, and the acceptability of transgender individuals in our culture. [insert card, of course]”
- d. “C. Standards: Fundamentally debate is a game, we come together to compete, win trophies, and have a good time, that’s why we have a

judge. If we allow the game to be unfair, it both dissuades people from playing it, hurting their educational experience, but also devalues the experience we have of doing well, and winning rounds and tournaments by making it less meaningful. We need to maintain a fair playing field for the good of the activity and the round.

D. Voter

- a. This is where everyone messes up. Always destroy this part because 99% of the time, it sucks, a lot. Some (hopefully good) examples:
- b. "D. You vote on topicality because First, it dissuades my opponent from running untopical cases in the future because no one wants to lose and he could well hit another topicality violation the next time two, solving the problem of fairness for future rounds, Second because I can't anticipate untopical cases so I can't prepare for them, if he's winning his side of the flow because he decided to cheat and debate something beyond the resolution he shouldn't be rewarded, so don't vote for him, Third the ballot says to vote for whoever best upheld their side of the resolution but my opponent isn't talking about the resolution so it only makes sense to vote for me because I'm the only one with any meaningful offense. This comes before standards because the standards debate is only resolvable once we deal with topicality. If my opponent is losing here, there's no reason to care about his standard because the arguments that impact to it have nothing to do with the resolution
- c. "D. You vote here because my opponent needs to know this language is unacceptable, and because we're all here to do well (that's why we care about decisions at all) if you vote him down then he'll have a strong disincentive to use it in future debates. Even if this doesn't lead to an immediate mindset shift at least we're taking a stand against patriarchy: to vote aff is, explicitly or implicitly, to put a stamp of approval on this language. When we stand against it we go against the tide of society and spark a discussion that can raise awareness instead of simply letting it slide. This comes before standards because it matters in the real world, in thirty minutes no one will care about the arguments in this debate and only the out of round impacts will continue. Because everything at the standards level functions only in the context of a game you look here first, it's actually important.
- d. "D. You vote on abuse because my opponent is cheating to win, the only way to restore fairness in this and future debates is to create a disincentive for unfair activity. If you simply ignore the argument, my opponent has no disincentive to run it in future rounds because at worst it doesn't allow him to cheat but it's never risky. If fairness is important in debate you vote here. This comes before standards because it's an issue with how my opponent is constructing the framework for the round. If you look to standards first you can never solve this problem because you allow the abuse to continue.

Topicality

Topicality generally falls under theory debate and it is saying (often using framework) what is debating the topic and what isn't. You have to use theory under it to explain why we care.

Spread

A spread is when you put as many arguments you can into a speech. I've seen 8 contentions and 15 responses to an argument. There's two ways to lay a spread, one is known as a fast spread the other is a slow spread.

Speed

When making a fast spread you speak at abnormally fast rates. Often not nearly as fast as policy debaters but still pretty fast. If you want to speed you need to make sure it's clear and worth it because if you speed just to be cool you'll end up with a short speech and looking toolish. As you debate LD longer you just normally start speak a lot faster than other speakers, and people, but it's not that bad.

Word Economy

When making a slow spread (I tended to be notorious for them, when my cases were actually prepared well in advance) you tend to focus on saying a lot more in less words, known as word economy (this technique is often used in combination with speed to make an even faster spread). This is why it's important to have a lot pre written. You need to spend a lot of time revising cases to get them shorter but still with a lot of substance.

I.e. My dog has beautiful big blue eyes...

My blue eyed dog.

(There's way to make your speech still sound eloquent when using word economy by just expanding your vocabulary. I.e. The judge is acting against logic by randomly enforcing rules solely based on the fact he has the power to.

The judge is acting arbitrarily.)

Judge Adaptation

Here are some notes from a lecture at camp. Always ask for preferences and paradigms (Arguments they tend to favor over another) of the judge when both you and your opponent are in the room.

- I. Judge adaptation is a winning strategy
 - a. It's about the judge
 - b. ALL ABOUT THE JUDGE
 - c. Be subservient to the judge
 - d. Being late and not pre-flowed gives a bad impression
 - e. Have their profiles and paradigms on internet
 - i. www.ndca.org
 - ii. Victory briefs
 - iii. www.Joyoftournaments.com
 - f. Judges love when you are receptive of what they're thinking in the round
 - g. Eye contact will make a better connection with judge
 - h. Change language to make connection with judge
 - i. Get them involved
 - j. Recognize their feedback by taking notes when they're giving you advice and such
 - k. Be passionate
 - l. Don't be extreme
 - m. Don't make them part of the debate
 - n. Don't shake your judge's hand it's really fake
- II. Simple tips for picking out your judge type
 - a. Recently graduated high school debaters
 - i. 1st year out: most dangerous judges

- ii. Very wide range
 - iii. Can be very nit-picky
 - iv. Don't generalize
 - v. Don't know their own paradigm
 - vi. Don't emulate their way of debate
 - vii. Highly critical and used to general topic
 - viii. Be very clear or they will intervene
- b. College assistant coach
 - i. Former debater or speech student
 - ii. On internship
 - iii. Will look at team they are helping
 - iv. Have a tendency to really like the argument their teams run
 - v. 8am rounds are very difficult round, since they tend to fall asleep, make it very clear
 - vi. NEVER MAKE A ROUND CLOSE
 - vii. Test the waters and do very weird things
 - viii. It's a game between coaches as well
- c. Traditional LD judge
 - i. They are getting younger and younger
 - ii. Afraid of where LD is going
 - iii. Will scowl
 - iv. Talk about the good old days
 - v. Not stupid
 - vi. It's how you present the argument
 - vii. Eliminate jargon
 - viii. Spoke about how it links to the value criterion
 - ix. Be polite
 - x. Need to communicate
 - xi. Use turns
- d. Policy judge/coach
 - i. Doesn't mean they like topicality and theory
 - ii. Most don't want to see policy in LD
- e. Parent (not always a lay judge)
 - i. Often are well involved in debate and have a general idea of the topic.
 - ii. Can occasionally at least attempt to flow
 - iii. Don't be mean to them, it's not exactly pleasant to judge debate
 - iv. Speak at a normal place
- f. Lay judge
 - i. SPEAK SLOWLY
 - ii. Define everything
 - iii. They're not flowing so focus on big picture
- III. Regional differences but similar rules to adaptations
 - a. Colleges in proximity
 - b. Schools in the area/local judge pool
 - c. Schools that regularly attend
 - d. National judging draw
- IV. National Circuit Tournaments
 - a. Be prepared for a wide range of judges
 - b. Don't talk about how bad the judging is because since the tournament is so large they're always in desperate need of judges

- c. There are various styles of debating depending on where the person is from
- d. There is often a lot of college students in the pool, mostly because they're getting paid.
- V. How to handle diverse judging panels
 - a. Focus on the majority
 - b. Handle the minority towards the end of the speech
- VI. Judge strikes
 - a. Strikes are when you can choose judges you don't want.
 - b. Strike judges that you don't know how they judge (check paradigms online first)
 - c. Strike judges that have been known for intervening.

Sample LD Case

Here's a set of cases with this topic:

2006 September/October Lincoln Financial Group/NFL L/D Debate Topic

Resolved: A just government should provide health care to its citizens.

Opening Statement: Life is the highest right that must be protected by the government. Because I affirm, resolved a just government should provide health care for its citizens

Definitions

Provide: To make available¹

Observation: Since the resolution says should and not can or must provide health care the affirmative's burden is to only prove that a just government has an obligation to provide health care to its citizens, so any implementation arguments made by the negative have no weight in this debate. This also means we are debating in theoretical contexts, so practicality is not germane to this debate.

Health Care: "The prevention, management, and treatment of illness and the preservation of physical and mental well-being through the services offered by the medical and allied health professions."

Citizens: A resident of a city or town, especially one entitled to vote and enjoy other privileges there.²

A just government: You can define just by using John Rawls theory of justice³, Rawls 1st principle explains that a government has to protect all the same basic rights and his second principle states "The second principle applies in the first approximation to the distribution of income and wealth and to design of organizations that make use of differences in authority and responsibility or chains of command. While the distribution of wealth and income need not be equal, it must be to everyone's advantage and at the same time, positions of authority and offices of command must be accessible to all. One applies the second principle by holding positions open and then, subject to this constraint, arranges social and economic inequalities so that everyone benefits."

Basically Rawls defines Justice in relation to government as fairness and giving each their due based on their needs to compete for social opportunities. The warrant for his theory is that there is no other purpose for a government but to protect rights otherwise the government becomes oppressive.

¹ Provide." *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition.* Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004. 06 Sep. 2006. <Dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=provide>>

² "citizens." *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition.* Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004. 06 Sep. 2006. <Dictionary.com <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=citizens>>

³ John Rawls: *A theory of justice*

You can link Rawls to John Locke⁴'s social contract in the aspect that they both advocate protecting basic rights. They agree on the fact that the government has to protect all of its citizen's rights.

Locke states that a legitimate government "teaches all mankind who will but consult that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possession. Legitimacy of a government is required to adjudicate disputes, ensure the protection of rights and to ensure the safety of the citizens. It follows naturally that the citizens benefit from this government protection" Peter Singer continues to expand on Locke's theory by defining the right of life to also including the basic essentials of life, since in order to live you must.

Because the Resolution states a just government as the actor, this government would always strive to justice and meeting their citizens needs as they sacrifice complete autonomy to fulfill all their needs, so you can use altruistic justice defined as giving each their due based on their needs as the value in their round. You can weigh who better achieves a just government by using the criterion by preserving the sanctity of life, since it is the only right that is a prerequisite to all other rights and thus has to be the basic way to determine if it is a just action.

Overall my thesis is that health care allows a just government to preserve the sanctity of life.

1st Contention. Health Care is inherent to protection of life

Sub point A: The threat of disease on life is massive and the government must protect its citizens from. The world health organization stated that in 2001 73% of deaths that year around the world were due to physical illness without including mental illnesses.

Threat of disease outweighs other threats that are protected and treated by agencies provided by the government. It is a known fact that only early detection of high probability of disease can treat it. Especially in the Heart disease and cancer epidemic that kills 1,400,000 in year alone.⁵ Both diseases can be easily prevented by regular visits to a health care professional. The threat of preventive disease is massive against the right to life, much more massive than threat of war and the threat of other citizens, the governments provides protection from. To protect its citizens from is from disease not any foreign, fire or other citizen.

Not only that but infectious disease could also prove detrimental to society if the government doesn't provide universal health care to its citizens because those that remain untreated would spread the disease. Without some basic health care no vaccines or treatments could be available to those that can't pay for it so, their life no longer becomes worth the cost and then they also can become dangers to the rest of the society. Thus the only way the government can preserve the sanctity of life is to provide health care to its citizens.

Sub point B: Health care is in our everyday lives.

I ask you to take a minute to go through your day and count how many times you took action to take care for your health. May it be putting on prescription glasses or contacts or taking a medication, health care is basic in every day life. In order to live and to ensure a good quality of life health care is inherent. By the government not providing universal health care you are denying them something that is inherent to their everyday lives. Basically health care is about life and protecting it. Something so basic to the sanctity of life must be provided by the government and not have any price tag.

2nd Contention: The government needs to provide health care to even the social and economic inequalities, by allowing them to compete for social opportunities.

Gary Jones explains, "The human need for at least minimal medical service is morally or legally significant and, in fact, implies a right to at least a minimum of health care, because a basic health is requisite for competing for social opportunities. Thus a right to health care is implied by a fundamental notion of fairness; it "makes sense" or is rational for society to provide such a service"⁶

Health care allows citizens to reach their full physical potential and thus allowing them to compete for social opportunities.

By not providing health care to all citizens then you are giving a social and economic advantage to those who can provide health care for themselves.

If you negate, you are causing harm to yourself and your fellow citizens as you will not be allowing them the opportunity to have free health care and allowing the government to skip out of their obligation to their citizens.

⁴ John Locke: Two treatises on government Chapters 1-5

⁵ from American Heart and cancer Association

⁶ Gary E. Jones: The right to health care and the state

Opening Statement: Because I believed a life without dignity is not worth living I negate, resolved, a just government should provide health care to its citizens.

An observation made of this resolution is that the resolution is not questioning whether or not health care is a good thing or not, but if a just government would be an effective actor to provide health care to the citizens of the society. We are also looking at a status quo in which a just government is currently deciding on whether providing health care would be an action they should do while keeping in mind that an action could easily turn a just government into an unjust one.

It also must be noted that there is no way for both a government provided health care and a privatized health care system to coexist. You can confirm this when you look to the free-rider theory in economics, which states that there is no way to market or put a price on a public good that is already given to all the citizens of society. For example, you do not see anyone marketing military, fire protection or even social security in the United States

Lastly the word "should provide" implies that a prerequisite of can provide. It is obvious in society that those that can't cannot have an obligation to do something. For example, we everyone that is a citizen has an obligation to vote and pay taxes, but the government removes that obligation for those that aren't capable to vote or pay taxes because they could be mentally incompetent or they need the money to pay for food versus paying taxes. So an obligation is always going to have a prerequisite of can behind it so that is another reason that in order to judge this round you are going to have to look to implementation and if a government can provide health care to its citizens.

Since we are looking at what a just government would do we have to look at what a just government holds as their highest value of preserving human worth. John Locke explains that a government is formed solely for the well being of the citizens of the society. So in any of a just government's decision we have to look at how to maintain human worth and thus work in the interest of the citizens. Locke also explains that humans are rational and should be allowed to execute their own life plan without involvement from the government as long as it doesn't interfere with another's life plan in order to preserve self worth. Thus in order to measure what better preserves human worth you have to look at how the government can best allow for citizens to fulfill their life plan and thus to maintain human worth a just government is one in which preserves individual autonomy.

Overall you are looking to human worth as the value in the round and the criterion of preservation of individual autonomy. My thesis is that government provided health care infringes on an individual's autonomy and thus degrades human worth. My sole contention is that privatized health care system is the better agent since it allows better promotion of health and also allows for more individual autonomy and thus the government has the moral obligation to turn over health care to the privatized market.

My sub point A is that the competition within the private market will always promote the best goods and show the better interests of society. Adam Smith explains with his theory of the invisible hand, which states that citizens of a society, when allowed, will pick the better product for the lowest price and any companies that cannot supply that would be eliminated. Thus as long as competition is allowed the best interests of the society would be exhibited in the goods and services provided by the remaining companies, thus if we allow competition of health care, than the best health care will remain available to the citizens, since the companies will be constantly innovating in order to survive. The impact of this is that the government, can not involve itself in health care because without competition than the health care system would not have motive to innovate and then health care would remain mediocre and thus the government has to consider this and realize that their involvement would actually degrade health and degrade the individual autonomy.

Sub point b: Government provided health care would infringe on citizens choosing what is in their own self-interest. Dr. Michael Fitzpatrick explains,

"When health becomes the goal of human endeavor it acquires an oppressive influence over the life of the individual. If people's lives are ruled by the measures they believe may help to prolong their existence, the quality of their lives is diminished. The tyranny of health means the ascendancy of the imperatives of biology over the aspirations of the human spirit. It provides the state, working both independently and through the agency of doctors and other health professionals, with a mechanism for extending its authority over the lives of each individual citizen and thereby over the whole society."⁷

Radley Balko of the Cato Institute continues to explain

"The creeping socialization of medicine gives government new license to meddle with our private affairs. It creates a climate where excessive state interference in the most intimate of personal matters-what we put into our mouths-becomes not acceptable among the electorate, but desirable. After all, if that cheeseburger your eating clogs your arteries and puts you in the hospital, your poor choices will be reflected in my health insurance premiums. If you're on Medicare or Medicaid, it'll show up in my taxes"⁸

Basically no just government wants to be blamed for doing to little in health care. The impact of this is that in order for the government to keep itself from violating individual autonomy then they must allow private market to continue without interference with in order to provide the best health care in the consideration of the citizens themselves.

Now to the affirmative side of the flow...

⁷ Michael Fitzpatrick (General Practitioner of Medicine, London, UK) Tyranny of Health: Doctors and the Regulation of Lifestyle. 2000 p 161

⁸ Radley Balko (Policy Analyst, Cato Institute) Does Obesity Justify Big Government September 2006

APPENDIX

Research

1. Purpose of Research in Debate
 - a. Background information
 - b. Cards
2. Process of Research
 - a. Pre-planning research
 - i. Understanding the terms of the resolutions
 1. DON'T USE WIKIPEDIA
 2. Black's law
 3. Merriam Webster's Dictionary Law
 4. Contextual definitions
 5. Define terms of art (multiple words defined together)
 - ii. What kind of resolution
 1. Comparative- compares two values
 2. Truth statement- Truth of the resolution
 3. Superlative
 - iii. What are the potential actors of the resolution
 - iv. Brainstorm search terms
 - b. What to look for first
 - i. Basic background information
 - ii. Articles with plenty of footnotes
 - c. How to know when you have good article
 - i. Don't read entire articles...
 - ii. Make a bibliography to look at first
 - iii. Read abstract and summary
 - iv. Read intro and conclusion (first 4 and last 4)
 1. If you can't tell, BAD ARTICLE!
 - v. CTRL+F
 - vi. Read first sentence of paragraph (topic sentence)
 1. Doesn't have topic sentence... BAD ARTICLE
 - vii. Skip case history
 - viii. Look at index (terms of art), and summary (not good book without index)
 - ix. Read books...
 - x. Look at bibliographies (commonly cited books must reads)
 - d. The hidden gold
 - i. Common things in bibliographies
 - ii. Look at book reviews
 - iii. Use Amazon and google print
 - iv. Look around area of where you found good books
3. Research Resources
 - a. Books/library
 - b. Internet
 - i. Scarsdale public schools library site (id:vaughanj pw:physics)
 - ii. Project Muse
 - iii. Science direct
 - iv. NY Times
4. General search tools
 - a. JSTOR
 - i. USE

1. Articles
 2. Great for philosophy and contemporary journal articles
 3. Be careful can be a little dated
- ii. How to use/tips
 1. Never use basic search use advanced search
 2. Click specific types of sources
 - a. econ, woman studies, law, philosophy, political science, population studies, psychology, sociology.
 3. Highlight and copy title and author and put synopsis in bibliography, FOOTNOTE IN CASE!!!! Academic document big must.
- b. Lexis Nexis
 - i. Use
 1. Legal Research
 2. Law reviews (make sure to click all available dates)
 - ii. How to use/tips
 1. Use expanded list and sort by relevance
- c. Project muse
 - i. Same as other sites

Materials

- Legal Pads
- Highlighters
- Cardstock (great for flowing and printing out cases, it's better to color code too)
- Binder (Good to keep a lot of articles together)
- Expando (good for keeping all your case stuff together)
- Precise V5 pens (the best for flowing, they're narrow tipped and don't smear too much on card stock)
- A tub (good for travel when you want to keep all your debate stuff together)
- A good book bag or messenger bag

How to Dress

Lincoln Douglas debaters are notorious for dressing more casual than other competitors (not as bad as policy but still). It's ok for girls to show up in slacks, flats and a button down shirt or sweater. Guys often wear slacks, a dress shirt with a tie and/or sweater or sweater vest. Girls if you wear heels bring a change of shoes so you can be comfortable in between rounds, I sometimes would wear demure sneakers in round. Certain tournaments are more traditional or lay so you want to go a little extra and dress like a public forum debater. This means heels and dress suit and hair up. Guys this means suit and combed back hair. Stick to darker colors and dark socks otherwise you stand out a little too much. Girls if you wear a skirt wear panty hose, it just looks better. Also avoid gaudy jewelry. Teams strive to coordinate. Get the same color shirts or idea. For example, Cesar and I both had blue striped shirts that'd we wear at the same time, vests and a blue shirt. I'd normally get a 5am phone call to make sure we were wearing the same thing and he'd always nag me to wear my heels.

The Big Ones (and the not so big ones)

State sort of big deal debate tournaments

Novice States

Varsity States

Winter Springs

Local for us but national tournament

Blue Key

Crestian

National Tournaments

Harvard

Yale

Glenbrooks

Emory (Invite and application only)

The tournaments everyone wants to get to

NFL nationals (only two per event and district can attend)

CFL nationals (Top 6 per event and district can attend)

The Tournament of Champions (Only those with at least 2 bids at national tournaments (reaching a certain out round pre designated) can attend, big Lincoln Douglas debate and other debate events but no IE's)

Resources

The best resources are the network of friends you create either on your team or others. They'll help as much as they can as long as you show the same courtesy. Also you can go to plenty of websites with boards and videos to help you practice flowing and case analysis. You can also buy briefs and evidence to ease the work.

www.victorybriefsdaily.com

www.trinitybriefs.com

www.ldboards.com

www.nationaldebaterankings.net

www.planetdebate.com

The Mindset

You will sooner or later hit big names but the trick is not to let yourself get psyched out and debate your best. Go in thinking that you already won by doing the work. It's also important to remain humble and you'll make great friends. Try not to worry and just have fun!