

Intro to LD Debate: Day 1 – What is a Value?

1. Begin by reading the princess story to the class.
2. After finishing the story, ask each student to rank the characters based on who they believe is most to blame for the princess' death.
3. After the individual rankings have been made, break the class into groups of 3-5 and have them come up with a group ranking. Explain that everyone in the group must agree to the ranking.

4. While groups are working, create a chart on the board like the one below:

Character	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Class total
Godfather				
Knight				
Prince				
Princess				
Vagabond				

5. Have a member of each group fill their rankings in on the chart.
6. Add the rankings to come up with a class total.
7. Ask members of each group why they ranked the characters they way they did. As they explain, write the key words they use in a separate list on the board. Most students will use words like “personal responsibility,” “family,” “love,” or “life” to explain why certain characters hold blame.
8. Explain that these key words are values much like those we use in LD and that while all values are inherently valuable, we may choose to support certain ones over others depending on what we are trying to prove in our LD case. For example, if the resolution is “Resolved: The godfather ought to have lent the princess money.” then we would choose family to be our affirmative value and, perhaps, personal responsibility as our negative one.
9. Continue the discussion into values listing more common LD values on the board (justice, freedom, liberty, security, societal welfare, etc.).
10. Have students complete the LD Values Worksheet.

Once upon a time a beautiful princess married a handsome prince and went off to live with him in his majestic castle. Throughout the next few years, the prince was seldom home and almost never took the princess to the balls and banquets she had been accustomed to attending when she married the prince. For the prince often went on long hunting expeditions and frequently had to leave town to meet with the King and discuss "business".

The princess grew bored and tired until one day a traveling vagabond happened to wander into a garden in which the princess was reading. In a matter of hours the vagabond had swept the princess off her feet with his stories of travel and adventure. She immediately agreed to run off with him.

After a night of passion, the princess woke up alone and with no way to get home except to travel through the forbidden forest. Now everyone knows that a princess cannot travel through the forbidden forest without an escort, for if she does this, the dragon will kill her.

Luckily, the princess thought to bring her cell phone and immediately calls a Knight-for-Hire. After hearing her story, the Knight agrees to escort the princess through the forest for \$5,000. The princess explains that all her money is back at the castle but will gladly pay the Knight once he gets her there. The Knight quips that he only accepts payment in advance and tells her to call back once she has the money.

Desperate and scared, the princess calls her Godfather. She explains her plight and asks for help. Her Godfather rebukes her for being so careless and explains that he will not give \$5,000 to a woman who would act as she has.

Feeling that she has no other choice, the princess begins to venture through the forest and towards home. She is, of course, killed by the dragon.

Who is most to blame for the princess's death? Rank the following characters in order 1=most at fault; 5=least at fault

Godfather  
Knight

Prince  
Princess

Vagabond

Alli Martin

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Hour \_\_\_\_\_

### Values in LD Debate

A value is defined as “a principle or belief considered worthwhile or desirable.”

1. Name three values
2. Explain why each of the above is a “principle or belief”.
3. Having value is not the same thing as being a value. Name three things that are tangible (you can hold or touch them) and have value but are not a “principle or belief”.
4. Methods for obtaining something are not values, for example, democracy is not a value but it achieves values. Name three values that democracy might help achieve.
5. Goals are not values. Free elections (voters being able to choose their leader) might be a good goal but they are not a value. Name one value that free elections might achieve.

## Intro to LD Debate: Day 2 – Approaching the Resolution

1. Write the current LD topic, or last one debated, on the board for the class. (or choose one that will be more interesting for students: should freedom of speech be extended to include the lyrics of music?)
2. Walk the class through the process of breaking down a resolution.
  - a. Define key terms
  - b. Frame areas of affirmative ground (what is the resolution asking and what is it clearly *NOT* asking?)
  - c. Create an initial research list of areas you feel you'll need to learn more about or questions that arise as a result of the topic
3. Create two columns, label the first "aff" and the second "neg." Explain that any and all potential arguments should be listed in the appropriate columns. This is not the time to rule ideas out as sometimes an argument that appears poor initially can lead to a unique and winning strategy later on.
4. Have class either shout out arguments (this approach works best if you focus on only one side at a time) or divide them into small groups and have them create arguments to then write on the board.
5. Discuss – go over each idea offered. Model the thinking you'd like your students to use as they tackle these ideas on their own.
6. Write the speech times on the board and explain the role of each speech:

Minutes	Speech	Notes
6	1 <sup>st</sup> Affirmative Constructive	Affirmative lays out her/his case
3	Neg cross-examines aff	
7	1 <sup>st</sup> Negative Constructive	Neg lays out a separate case opposing the resolution. Spends equal time attacking affirmative case
3	Aff cross-examines neg	
4	1 <sup>st</sup> Affirmative Rebuttal	Very difficult speech! Defends own case and attacks neg case.
6	Negative Rebuttal	Neg's final speech. Should attack every point made by aff and clearly articulate why they won the round
3	2 <sup>nd</sup> Affirmative Rebuttal	Usually crystalizes the round into key points where the aff should win. Line-by-line can be impressive here if done well.
4	<i>Prep time</i>	<i>Each debater has up to 4 minutes of prep time to use as needed before any of their speeches.</i>

7. Have two students come to the front of the room and visually walk the class through a round.

Homework: Assign class to research three arguments supporting the affirmative and three for the negative. Arguments should be written out and supported by evidence. Students should be

prepared with these during the next class session.

### Intro to LD: Day 3 – Case Structure

1. Often the most confusing component of Lincoln-Douglas debate is the criterion. A criterion is, simply put, a method by which humans can apply a value to a situation. For example, Henry might argue that personal freedom is the most important value in the world so therefore the government shouldn't regulate our individual choices. If someone wants to smoke cigarettes, they should be allowed to decide that for themselves. Hazel, on the other hand might agree that personal freedom is the most important value but may feel that because some substances, like cigarettes, are addictive, the government is justified in limiting our access to them and thus preserving personal freedom.

Both debaters in the above example value the same thing but they apply that value in very different ways. The method by which a value is applied in LD is called the "criterion" or the criteria for judging the round. Henry's criterion may be Libertarianism while Hazel's may be Utilitarianism. Both claim to result in the same good (personal freedom) but do so in different ways.

It's important to point out that while the words "value" and "criterion" seem alien, the principles behind LD are no different than those one would have when discussing similar topics with friends and family. Often a group of friends will all agree on a topic but for very different reasons or disagree on a topic while maintaining similar values. This is where criterion comes in to the debate.

If students are still confused, ask them to think of examples or share some from the attached page.

2. Explain that while there are no rules governing how an LD case must be structured, most LDers will use the following format.
  - a. State side (I affirm, I negate), recite the resolution
  - b. Define key terms
  - c. Value (defined and justified – this value is important because...)
  - d. Criterion (defined and justified – this method is best because...)
  - e. Contentions
3. Ask students to get out their homework arguments. Explain that these will become the contentions in their cases.
4. Have students work together to find a value that their arguments support. They'll need one value for each side but they do not need to be the same.
5. Pass out the "case outline" worksheets and have students begin filling them in. Explain that when they get to the criterion section, they should do their best to explain the logic of their thinking and not worry about naming a system or philosophy. If you have time, help them name their systems (Oh, you think every citizen should have a say in who leads their nation? We call that "Democracy.").
6. Students should come to class next time with completed cases.

Alli Martin

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Period \_\_\_\_\_

*Intro:*

I affirm the resolution “Public health concerns justify compulsory immunization.”

For purposes of clarification, I offer the following definitions from \_\_\_\_\_

PUBLIC:

HEALTH:

CONCERNS:

JUSTIFY:

COMPULSORY:

IMMUNIZATION:

The value I will uphold throughout this round will be \_\_\_\_\_.

*Justification:*

My criterion will be \_\_\_\_\_. *Justification & link to value/reso:*

Alli Martin

(add 2-3 contentions on the back of this page)

Alli Martin

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Period \_\_\_\_\_

*Intro:*

I negate the resolution "Public health concerns justify compulsory immunization."

For purposes of clarification, I offer the following counter -definitions from \_\_\_\_\_

PUBLIC:

HEALTH:

CONCERNS:

JUSTIFY:

COMPULSORY:

IMMUNIZATION:

The value I will uphold throughout this round will be \_\_\_\_\_.

*Justification:*

My criterion will be \_\_\_\_\_. *Justification & link to value/reso:*

(add 2-3 contentions on the back of this page)



Real-World Examples of Criteria Debate:

- *Same value, different criteria:* Chris and Amanda are discussing capital punishment. Chris feels the government should kill those who have been convicted of killing others. Amanda disagrees. Both value human life but Chris feels that to honor that value, they “ultimate price” must be paid for taking it. Amanda feels that to honor that value, no one should ever take a human life even as retribution.
- *Different values, same criteria:* Jason and Cami both want their child to eat the carrots he has on his plate. Jason feels that nutrition is very important and wants to impart that value onto his child. Cami feels that it is even more important to teach their child not to be wasteful. During their discussion, it becomes apparent that while they both want the same thing, their values are very different. In explaining why he feels nutrition is more important than conservation, Jason states that as a Buddhist, he feels strongly that people should honor their bodies and treat them with respect thereby eating healthy. Cami responds by explaining that as a Buddhist, she feels an interconnectedness with all living things and that since these carrots gave their lives for human consumption, to waste them would be unethical.
- *Different values, different criteria:* Peter and Jamal were discussing politics over a family dinner. Peter is a proud Obama supporter and feels that the President was right to push for comprehensive health care coverage for all Americans. He argues that all Americans should have access to quality healthcare and that it is a shame that other countries give their citizens more benefits than we do. Jamal strongly disagrees and argues that what makes America great is that we ask our citizens to be self-reliant. If someone wants healthcare, they can get a job and work for it. No one ever got anywhere on handouts. Peter and Jamal begin having the same argument they have every time they get together, no matter the topic they disagree because Peter values Community Welfare and feels that is often best achieved by Communitarianism (a belief system focusing on individuals working together to help many) whereas Jamal values Individual Freedom achieved through Laissez-Faire Capitalism.

Intro to LD: Day 4 & 5 – Practice Rounds

1. Divide students into groups of 4.
2. Explain that two in each group need to debate each other first while the other two take notes and offer support. Then the pairs will switch.
3. Once divided, have the first two debaters choose sides. The remaining two students will each partner up with one of the debaters to offer whispered support when needed but mostly to flow and observe the round.
4. After the first round, students should fill out the appropriate evaluation form(s) and discuss the round with each other. Then the next pairing should debate.

### SELF EVALUATION

1. Which side did you debate?
2. How do you personally feel about this side of the debate? Do you agree or disagree with it?
3. How do you feel about your case? Is it strong? Are you happy with it? Why?
4. What would you change about your case to make it better?
5. How do you feel about your rebuttals? Were they strong?
6. What would you do differently if you could do the round over?
7. What do you feel you did well in this round?

## OPPONENT EVALUATION

1. What is your opponent's name?
2. How do you feel about your opponent's case? Was it good? Were there good arguments in it?
3. Did your opponent bring up arguments you hadn't expected? If yes, give examples. If not, explain how you anticipated these arguments.
4. How do you feel about your opponent's rebuttals? Were they strong?
5. What would you do feel your opponent could have improved?
6. What do you feel your opponent did well in this round?

### OBSERVATION OF ROUND

1. Who did you watch debate? List names and sides.
2. In your opinion, who was the stronger debater, why?
3. What could the weaker debater have done to win the round?
4. Was there sufficient “clash” or direct argument in the round?
5. Were most of the arguments presented logical? Did they make sense?
6. What was your favorite argument in the round?
7. After watching this debate, what will you do differently as a debater? Basically, what did you learn from this round?