

JCHS Speech & Debate



Lincoln-Douglas Debate Manual

Speech Order

AC (Affirmative Constructive)-----6 minutes

Affirmative cross-examined by Negative-----3 minutes

NC/1NR (Negative Constructive/First Rebuttal)-----7 minutes

Negative cross-examined by Affirmative-----3 minutes

1AR (Affirmative Rebuttal)-----4 minutes

2NR (Second Negative Rebuttal)-----6 minutes

2AR (Second Affirmative Rebuttal)-----3 minutes

TOTAL PREP TIME FOR EACH TEAM-----4 minutes

SPEAKER RESPONSIBILITIES

1AC	1NC/1NR
<p>Persuasively present your prewritten affirmative case.</p> <p>Being persuasive means: -Make Eye Contact! -Sound like you believe what you are saying -Use inflection (sound like you know what you are saying)</p>	<p>The debater has two responsibilities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Persuasively present your prewritten negative case. 2. After reading your case, the negative must also respond to the affirmative’s arguments in the order they were presented. <p><u>To respond:</u> Step One: Signpost - “My opponent said...”</p> <p>Step Two: Give your response - “However, my response is...”</p> <p>Step Three: Explain how response defeats your opponent’s point - “My point defeats their point because...”</p>

1AR	2NR	2AR
<p>In this speech, the affirmative should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respond to the arguments of the negative case, exposing flaws. 2. Rebuild their own case by extending the evidence read in the 1AC and even bringing up additional supporting evidence. <p><u>To respond:</u> Step One: Signpost - “My opponent said...” Step Two: Give your response - “However, my response is...” Step Three: Explain how response defeats your opponent’s point - “My point defeats their</p>	<p>In this speech, the negative should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respond to the attacks the affirmative made against the negative, extending the evidence read in the NC. 2. Outline voting issues (or reasons why you won the debate). Your voters should include at least (1) Value Clash, show why your value is best (2) One to two strong arguments you are winning. 	<p>Outline voting issues (or reasons why you won the debate). Your voters should include at least (1) Value Clash, show why your value is best (2) One to two strong arguments you are winning.</p>

point because...”		
-------------------	--	--

CONVINCING THE JUDGE

1. **BEFORE THE ROUND:** Talk to your judge—before the debate, it is fine to ask the judge if they have judged Lincoln-Douglas Debate before. Most judges will be happy to answer. You could also ask, “I want to make sure I adapt to you, so I was wondering if there are any styles of debate that you prefer?”

2. **DURING THE DEBATE:** Watch your judge—some judges will smile, frown, nod, or shake their head, look bored or engaged, or give you other non-verbal signals that they like or don’t like the argument you’re making. Watch the judge and have your partner watch the judge to see what they like and dislike. Focus on that argument in later speeches, and you’ll have a good chance to win.

3. **DELIVERY:** all judges appreciate a good, logical argument...and all judges appreciate a speaker who has polished speaking.

4. **BE RESPECTFUL TO ALL:** all judges desire professionalism. In fact, some judges base their entire decision on this.

Framework

What is the purpose of framework? Why is it important?

Defined: Framework establishes the absolutes, assumptions, and/or area that you believe are the most important in the debate.

Another way to think about it:

- A frame is what holds a picture into place on a wall. Your framework is what holds all your arguments together.

What does framework include?

- Definitions of important terms
- Value
- Criterion

Value

Defined: a value is quality that you find important. It is the ultimate impact that you hope to achieve on your side of the debate. So, the value is what we get if we vote for you.

Common Values:

- Justice
- Morality
- Liberty

Criterion

Defined: a criterion explains how to measure, or achieve, the value.

- **Example:** my principal cannot walk into my classroom and see *education*. How does he know that my students are being educated? Your criterion answers that question.

Common Criterion:

- Minimizing Oppression
- Utilitarianism
- Kant's Categorical Imperative
- Pragmatism

HOW TO GIVE AN EXCELLENT REBUTTAL

Questions to Ask Yourself:

- What arguments of theirs is the strongest?
- What's wrong with their argument?
- Are there some ideas/points in their argument that I should accept?
- How do their points interact with my case arguments?

The Basics of Responding to Points:

- **DENIAL:** "My opponent's point is wrong..."
- **REVERSE:** "My opponent's point actually works in my favor..."
- **MINIMIZE:** "My opponent makes a point that is not significant..."
- **OUTWEIGH:** "My point about _____ is more important than this point because..."

DEFENSIVE ARGUMENTS TO GIVE IN THE REBUTTAL

DEFENSIVE ARGUMENTS DEFINED:

Defensive arguments are arguments that give reasons not to vote for your opponent

List of Defensive Arguments:

- Attacking Evidence
- Attacking Arguments
 - Non-Unique
 - De-Link
 - Mitigate
 - No impact
 - No solvency
 - Indict (Evidence Attacks)
- Contradictions

DEFENSIVE ARGUMENTS EXPLAINED

NON-UNIQUE: the impact will happen in the status quo with or without the argument. In other words, you simply show how their position does not positively or negatively change anything.

DE-LINK: the “no link” response says that your opponent fails to show how their position will directly lead to their impact. Your opponents must present evidence to show that their side of the resolution *connects* to the impacts.

MITIGATE: this argument simply diminishes, or makes the point less significant. When you mitigate something, you tell me why a point does not matter in the big picture.

NO IMPACT: the “no impact” response says that the argument of the opposition does not actually trigger, or cause, an impact in the real world.

NO SOLVENCY: the “no solvency” response says that the opposition fails to solve for the impacts they claim.

INDICT: this is when you are attacking the evidence

Attacking Evidence

1. **BIAS**—look at the authors. Bias can be revealed in their job title, their affiliations, the manner in which they state their views. Evidence should be unbiased. If it is not, then point it out.
2. **DATES**—debate concerns itself with rapidly changing issues. If the evidence is old, then say, “their evidence is old and our claims post-date their evidence.”
3. **NO CAUSALITY**—if the affirmative makes a claim and says that one event or idea led to another, but has no specific link that connects them, point out to the judge saying, “their evidence and their claims do not correlate.”
4. **“DOES IT MAKE SENSE?” TEST**—attack the logic of the evidence when it is unclear. Or provide counterexamples and/or your own knowledge to attack the evidence that is unclear.

Evidence Comparisons

“How do I persuade my judge to consider my evidence over my opponents?”

1. **Recency:** your evidence comes after theirs. Judge should prefer evidence that is closer to the day of the debate because time changes things.
2. **Empirics:** your evidence cites specific examples and is grounded in historical precedence.
3. **Expertise:** your evidence quotes experts of the field and can be trusted over that of your opponents.
4. **Better Warranted:** the argument presented by the author is better explained and justified.

WHAT TO DO IF... VALUES & CRITERIA ARE THE SAME

1. The debate should focus on **how your arguments/contentions support the framework.**
2. Debaters need to **discuss how it's difficult or impossible for opponent to support the value/criterion.**
3. ALL arguments in the debate need to filter through the value and criteria; there's no room to bring in some contention that doesn't relate to the value/criterion.
4. After the tournament, **re-examine case to determine whether value/criterion could be more precise or specific** (without sacrificing moral strength of the framework)

WHAT TO DO IF... VALUES SAME & CRITERIA DIFFERENT

5. Debate on framework should focus on why **your criterion successfully upholds the value more universally than your opponents.**
6. Debate **instances/flaws with where opponent's criterion cannot produce the value in the debate.**
7. **Attempt to "capture" your opponent's criterion.** Explain how supporting your side of the resolution or how your contentions support their criterion, thereby allowing the judge to embrace both frameworks and still vote for your side.

WHAT TO DO IF... VALUES & CRITERIA ARE DIFFERENT

8. **Debate why your value is more important than your opponent's.**
9. **Use your value to "capture" your opponent's value.** Argue that your value is a prerequisite to achieving your opponent's value.
10. **Use your value criterion to "capture" your opponent's value.** Argue that by achieving your criterion, you can also accomplish your opponent's value.
11. **Use your case contentions/side of the resolution to "capture" your opponent's criterion.** Explain how upholding your side of the resolution provides conditions to achieve their criterion.
12. **Argue that there are flaws in your opponent's contentions connecting their criterion.**
13. **Argue that there are flaws in your opponent's value/value criterion relationship.** Explain how their criterion doesn't support their value.

WHAT TO DO IF... VALUES DIFFER & CRITERIA ARE SAME

14. **Debate why your value is more important than your opponents.**
15. **Use your value to capture their value.**
16. **Argue that there are flaws in your opponent's contentions connecting to their criterion.**
17. **Argue that there are flaws in your opponent's value/value criterion relationship.**

Reminders About Cross-Examination ASKING QUESTIONS

1. **Work hard to be an expert!** Ensures confidence in the arguments. Be assertive and if you don't understand something...ask.
2. **Think Strategically!** What is the goal you seek in asking your questions? Do you want to prove the opponent fails to achieve their own value/criterion? Do you want to show how they fail to link to their own arguments? ***You need to have a goal when you are asking questions. SET UP YOUR POINTS.***
3. **Ask questions about evidence.** If something sounds too good to be true...it probably is. Ask questions about the expertise of the authors (especially the solvency advocate).
4. **Politely Interrupt.** If you ask a question and fail to receive the answer you desire, politely interrupt and say, "I'm sorry, but you are not answering my question, the question was..."
5. **Don't be afraid to move on!** There is rarely a time in CX when you need to spend the entire time on one question. Ask, then move on. If you aren't satisfied with the answer they provide, ask again, but then move on.

Cross-Examination Questions You COULD always ask

1. How does your criterion uphold your value?
2. How does your (argument) achieve your value criterion/value?
3. Why is your criteria the most important criteria in the round?
4. What philosopher are you using to uphold your value/criteria?

Cross-Examination Questions to ask the AFFIRMATIVE

1. So you say (insert argument they make), but couldn't this be solved by improving standardized tests, rather than eliminating them?
2. If we remove standardized tests, what would be considered in the admissions process?
3. What is stopping teachers from being biased in assigning grades to students?
4. (For an oppression affirmative) Would getting rid of standardized tests solve all oppression?

Cross-Examination Questions to ask the NEGATIVE

1. Are standardized tests always helpful to students when they are applying for different colleges?
2. Do standardized tests give students of unequal opportunities a chance to beat the system?
3. How will a world without standardized tests be enforced? How will you ensure all are treated equally and fair?
4. How does your world without standardized tests benefit those students who attend low-income schools?

Reminders About Cross-Examination ANSWERING QUESTIONS

1. **Exploit open-ended questions! Less is more.** If your opponents ask you an open-ended question (who, what, when, where, why, how), they are inviting you to showcase your knowledge and evidence. Take advantage of this—why? Because the more you showcase your knowledge, the more you waste their time in CX.
2. **Don't be afraid to have them repeat the question!** If you need to buy yourself some time OR if you genuinely do not understand the question, then ask them to repeat or rephrase the question.
3. **You have a partner for a reason.** Don't be afraid to say: "My partner will address that in the next speech?" This is an effective way to dodge.
4. **You don't know every answer.** One of the biggest mistakes people make is trying to give an answer to a question they don't know the answer to. It usually turns out POORLY. If someone asks: "Who is Mr. Blah?" It is okay to say, "I'm not sure, but the warrants are..."

WAYS TO WEIGH IMPACTS

1. **Timeframe:** at what point will the impacts occur?
 - We should avoid the bad things that happen sooner, vice versa
2. **Magnitude:** how large in number are your impacts?
 - We should try to avoid the largest impact, vice versa
3. **Probability:** how likely are the impacts?
 - We should avoid bad things that are more likely, vice versa
4. **Duration:** how long will the impacts be felt?
 - We should avoid those impacts that last longest
5. **Reversibility:** how easy is the damage to undo?
 - We should avoid those impacts that are hardest to undo

Steps to RESPONDING to arguments	Steps to giving a great REBUTTAL
<p>Step One: SIGNPOST (tell me what part of the flow you are on) --"My opponent said..."</p> <p>Step Two: GIVE YOUR RESPONSE (counterclaims) --"However, my response is..." --May/may not include evidence</p> <p>Step Three: EXPLAIN RESPONSE (tell me how your response neutralizes your opponent's argument) --"This defeats their point because..."</p>	<p>With each major argument that you clashed with (Topicality, Solvency, Advantages, Disadvantages, etc.):</p> <p>Step One: SUMMARIZE WHAT YOUR OPPONENT SAID --"On (insert issue), my opponent claims..."</p> <p>Step Two: SUMMARIZE WHAT YOU SAID --"However, we have shown..."</p> <p>Step Three: EXPLAIN WHY WHAT YOU SAID IS BETTER --"Our argument is better because..."</p> <p>Step Four: EXPLAIN HOW YOU OUTWEIGH --"As a result of being better, we outweigh on (insert weighing mechanism) because..."</p>