



RICHMOND DEBATE INSTITUTE

www.RichmondDebate.com
Richmond Debate LLC © Copyright 2021

Debate is the entertainment of ideas.

Not who's right or wrong.

Be nice. Be courteous.

Table of Contents

Lincoln Douglas: Intro to LD Debate	4
What is LD Debate?.....	5
Speech Order.....	7
Affirmative Constructive.....	8
Values and Value Criterion.....	9
Examples of Values and Value Criteria.....	10
Example Contentions.....	11
Negative Constructive	12
Overview.....	13
Example Negative Constructive.....	14
Example Negative Rebuttal.....	15
Goals for Each Speech	16
Cross Examination	19
Types of Questions.....	20
Weighing Impacts	21
Comparing Impacts and Values.....	22

Lincoln-Douglas

Intro to LD Debate

What is Lincoln Douglas Debate?

- Lincoln-Douglas debate students **compete as individuals**
- Each **student will prepare two cases**, one for each side of the debate topic, to compete in tournaments
- Tournaments have many rounds, where **competitors argue their assigned side** in each round
- Competitors argue **to win the judge's vote** as the most persuasive side
- To create a case, students write contentions to support their **value and value proposition**
- The **topic changes every 2 months**, voted by national committees of the NSDA (National Speech and Debate Association)

RESOLVED: The public's right to know should to be valued above a candidate's right to privacy when running for public office.

Lincoln Douglas Speaking Orders

Affirmative Constructive	6 minutes	1AC
Cross Examination	3 minutes	CX
Negative Constructive	7 minutes	1NC + 1NR
Cross Examination	3 minutes	CX
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4 minutes	1AR
Second Negative Rebuttal	6 minutes	2NR
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3 minutes	2AR

Each debater has **4 minutes of prep time**, typically before a speech. Competitors keep track of their used prep time throughout the debate round.

Example Constructive Case

Resolution

Restate the debate topic and your position at the top of case

Resolved: In a democracy, the public's right to know ought to be valued above the right to privacy of candidates for public office. It is for this reason that I **affirm** today's resolution

For the purpose of my affirmation, I present the **value of societal welfare**. According to the [Oxford Living Dictionaries](#), societal welfare is the well being of a community. Societal welfare is the ability to put society first and to think of society as a whole and all of its values it represents. The public right to know should be valued at the highest priority because the candidates right to privacy would sacrifice societal welfare.

Value & Value Criterion

The value is the ideal which society should aim for. The value criterion is the way society can achieve that ideal.

My value criterion is cost-benefit analysis. According to the [Cambridge Dictionary](#), Cost-Benefit analysis is the process of comparing the cost involved in doing something to the advantages it brings. If the cost of something outweighs the benefit of something, then that endeavor should not be taken. Cost-benefit analysis is a tool of measurement, in this case, a measurement of societal welfare. The public's right to know should be valued higher than the candidate's right to privacy in a democracy because the alternative would have more costs than benefits.

Contentions

Cases may have 1 to 3 contentions, beginning by stating the argument's tagline before analysis.

Contention 1: In order to make informed decisions in voting, the public has to know who they are voting for.

What comes with information is power. When people have the means to further understand candidates, they are given the ability to become a more informed citizen. They can choose candidates that they like best because they know all the information that they think is relevant to them about the candidate. When information is deprived, people do not know who they're voting for, and maybe are voting for a candidate who has a certain prejudice that negatively affects their decision making. An elected official in a democracy is imperative. They are the link between the people who are actual change. They have the most power to change the world because the people have built them a pedestal to stand on from the vote and their taxpayer dollars. This pedestal gives them a view far wider than the average American. It is a privilege. Judge it is imperative to the society for people to be informed about who they are voting for. Because it is not just at the expense of the voter but it is at the expense of the entire society because they make decisions for them. **The impact of this judge is that the cost of negative drastically outweigh the benefits, and democracies simply cannot afford it.** [Andrew \(2004\) of the United Nations Development Program Bureau for Development Policy said-](#) "The result is that more information in the hands of citizens, even where corruption persists, it can be exposed and eliminated." sunshine is the best disinfectant."

Impact

Each contention should have an impact to state why it matters

Evidence

Cite any evidence you use in the case! Make sure you store the evidence on your computer

Value and Value Criterion

- Value: The most important *moral ideal* you wish to defend. This should be something that your contentions pursue.
- Value Criterion: How to measure or capture your ideal value. This should be strongly linked to the outcomes of your arguments.

Resolved: In a democracy, the public's right to know ought to be valued above the right to privacy of candidates for public office. It is for this reason that I **affirm** today's resolution

For the purpose of my affirmation, I present the **value of societal welfare**. According to the [Oxford Living Dictionaries](#), societal welfare is the well being of a community. Societal welfare is the ability to put society first and to think of society as a whole and all of its values it represents. The public right to know should be valued at the highest priority because the candidates right to privacy would sacrifice societal welfare.

My value criterion is cost-benefit analysis. According to the [Cambridge Dictionary](#), Cost-Benefit analysis is the process of comparing the cost involved in doing something to the advantages it brings. If the cost of something outweighs the benefit of something, then that endeavor should not be taken. Cost-benefit analysis is a tool of measurement, in this case, a measurement of societal welfare. The public's right to know should be valued higher than the candidate's right to privacy in a democracy because the alternative would have more costs than benefits.

Your arguments will uphold your value by aiming to achieve your value criterion!

Examples: Values and Value Criteria

Affirmative

- Value: Democracy
 - Value Criterion Possibility 1: Maximizing popular control of government
 - Value Criterion Possibility 2: Government transparency
- Value: Governmental Legitimacy
 - Value Criterion Possibility 1: Maximizing integrity of government decision makers
 - Value Criterion 2: Preventing Elitism
- Value: Classical Republicanism
 - Value Criterion Possibility 1: Civic Virtue
 - Value Criterion Possibility 2: Quality of Democratic Deliberation

Negative

- Value: Individual Rights
 - Value Criterion Possibility 1: Maximizing liberty and privacy
 - Value Criterion Possibility 2: Preventing government abuse of power
- Value: Societal Welfare
 - Value Criterion Possibility 1: Minimizing injustice and violence
 - Value Criterion Possibility 2: Quality of Elected Officials
- Value: Human Dignity
 - Value Criterion Possibility 1: Personal privacy
 - Value Criterion Possibility 2: Maximizing Autonomy

Your arguments will uphold your value by advocating for a world that depicts the value criterion!

Contentions: Constructive Arguments

“**I affirm**, resolved, the public’s right to know should be valued above a candidate’s right to privacy when running for public office.”

- Value: Democracy
 - Value Criterion: Government Transparency

Contention 1: The public has a right to know of possible ‘dark money’ campaign financing

The public’s right to know clearly trumps a candidate’s right to privacy in cases like campaign finance. Stewart writes in 2018 writes about how changes made to the IRS tax code have made it “easier for ‘dark money’ donors to keep their contributions in the dark.” Politicians have no incentive to legislate against this occurrence because it gets them elected. Therefore, the public must value its right to know to return transparency to US Democracy and prevent politicians from acting in such a way that supports unrevealed special interests to the detriment of the common good.

“**I negate**, resolved, the public’s right to know should be valued above a candidate’s right to privacy when running for public office.”

- Value: Human Dignity
 - Value Criterion: Medical Privacy

Contention 1: The public should respect the medical privacy of candidates

In democracies like the US, the public’s right to know is already dangerously valued over a candidate’s privacy, demonstrated by the famous example of Thomas Eagleton, a vice presidential nominee for the Democratic party in 1972. Thompson describes in 2015 how Eagleton’s medical privacy was breached. After it was leaked that he had depression, he was bullied out of the running for his position. This is a form of ableism that would persevere in a society that values the public’s right to know over privacy, and it is morally wrong because it promotes the discrimination against people who should have a voice in politics. The concept of shared human dignity says that all people deserve some basic degree of respect due to their membership of the human race. Those who hold and who aspire to hold public office must receive respect accordingly.

Negative Construction

Construction (1NC) + Rebuttal (1NR)

Negative Constructive (1NC + 1NR)

- The negative constructive has to **present its own case and refute the affirmative's case**
- The **first negative's construction, "1NC"**, has its own set of value and value criterion and supporting contentions
 - Most negative cases only have two contentions to conserve time for the rebuttals
- The **first negative rebuttal, "1NR"**, aims to attack the affirmative's case by undermining its value, value criterion, and contentions.
- In the 7-minute speech, the construction will be pre-written but the rebuttal will not.
 - All speeches after this will mostly be created on the spot as well.

Negative Construction (1NC)

The resolution contends that a public's right to know ought to supersede a candidate's right to privacy, but to do so would be unjust to the candidate and it would undermine the order upon which a democracy is founded and give way to the fear that Murrow warns us of. Thus, I negate the resolution.

My value for this debate is Human Dignity. Human Dignity requires that we respect each person for having innate and inherent value.

My criterion is Maximizing Autonomy. We should protect all people's autonomy in society because without autonomy, democracy does not exist. The purpose of self-governance must exist on the individual level before society can self-determine through democratic processes. Otherwise, we sacrifice the individual for the collective and neglect the fundamental human dignity which should not be trampled by unbridled democracy.

Contention 1: Candidates would be targeted for their personal lives as opposed to being judged for their views, thus corrupting the objective of a democracy

A society that values the public's right to know would potentially harm a candidate's rights to practice their religion freely. Many polls have identified prejudice that voters have towards minority groups like members of the LGBTQ community, women, Black people, hispanics, and religious groups like Muslims and atheists. According to a study done by Gallup, when voters were asked the question "Would you vote for a generally well qualified person who is gay or lesbian?" 30% of people said they would not. The situation is even worse for Muslims and atheists who have 40% and 43% respectively of people say they wouldn't vote. For religious groups and members of the LGBTQ community, their membership to these groups is a private matter that has no bearing over their political beliefs. This in combination with the sensitive nature of these topics means that a just society would protect the rights of LGBTQ people to exist freely by expressing their sexuality privately, and it would protect the rights of religious minorities to practice their religion in private. Allowing the public's right to know to take precedence over the rights and liberties of candidates means that minority groups will never be allowed equal footing on a political level. Allowing public debates to become about irrelevant characteristics like religion and sexuality undermines these groups' autonomy insofar as their freedom of conscience is not respected in the same domains as traditionally accepted views. Autonomy cannot exist when the majority of a society can coerce people with political aspirations out of their religious beliefs and sexual identity. Without that autonomy, human dignity will collapse.

Arguments

("Contentions")

Cases should have multiple arguments First state the tagline before beginning analysis.

Evidence

Cite any evidence you use in the case! Make sure you store the evidence on your computer

Value

The value is the goal which society should aim for

Value Criterion

The Value Criterion is the way which society can achieve that goal

Impact

Each contention should have an impact to state why it matters

Negative Rebuttal (1NR)

Indicate your transition from your construction to the rebuttal.

If you have multiple criticisms of an argument, try numbering them to help your judge.

“

I will now move on to my opponent's case.

At my opponent's value of **Societal Welfare**, we should prefer my value of **Human Dignity** because societal welfare cannot be constructed without respect for the humanity possessed by individual citizens who make up any given society. Therefore, before the welfare of that political body can be defined, human dignity at the individual level ought to be upheld.

At my opponent's value criterion of **cost-benefit analysis**, we cannot engage in such analysis when it can permit unacceptable consequences like ableism to affect a minority. Imposing some costs on the individual ought not be permissible just because a marginal benefit is possible for the majority. Instead, we should prefer my criterion of **maximizing autonomy** because it prevents those unacceptable consequences from hurting those worst off in society, even when that creates a marginal imposition on society as a whole.

At my opponent's contention 1 **where they argue that the public will become more informed and thus able to vote**, they do not recognize two things:

- 1) the public does not vote as a result of too little information being available. While some may say they do not know enough about the issues and candidates of a particular election, they could easily learn by using internet and public libraries to learn basic information, yet they often do not as seen in Professor Mandgi's work at the Richmond Debate Institute.
- 2) The availability of information that would require the sacrifice of a candidate's privacy is of no importance and would actually derail productive political discourse and potentially enable issues like ableism. If the media talked about, for example, a candidate's depression, such a conversation would have little relevance to the candidate's political abilities but would destroy the public discourse surrounding the candidate and cultivate an ableist population fixated on such things.

”

Tell your judge what part of your opponent's case you are addressing to help organize their notes.

Consider briefly summarizing your opponent's argument to help jog your judge's memory of what you're addressing.

Goals for Each Speech: Part 1

Affirmative Constructive (6 min) - “1AC”

- Introduce yourself as the affirmative and
- read the Resolved at the top of the speech.
- Only include definitions in your case if you think definitions will be contested.
- Read your case clearly and make eye contact with the judge, especially when stating contention taglines.
- “It is for all these reason I ask you to affirm the resolution. I stand ready for cross-ex.”

Negative Constructive (7 min) - “1NC+1NR”

Construction (~4 minutes)

- Read your case clearly and make eye contact with the judge.
 - Apply your contentions to their case if they apply.
-

Rebuttal (~3 minutes)

- “Now I will move on to attacking my opponent’s case.”
- Point out differences in Value and Value Criterion. Point out why yours are better than theirs.
- Let the judge know which of their points you’re referring to when you are refuting them.

Goals for Each Speech: Part 2

First Affirmative Rebuttal (4 min) - “1AR”

- Tell the judge your road map for answering arguments (extend your own, *then* counter theirs).
- Focus on extending your evidence.
- Do impact calculus, and explain how your impacts tie to the Value and Value Criterion.
- Clearly state when you are moving from your case to your opponents
- Cards analytics can help you rebut- know which ones you want to use for each argument and balance, so you don't depend on one more than the other
- If your opponents forget to mention an argument, point out that they cannot bring it up in their next speech.

Second Negative Rebuttal (6 min) - “2NR”

- Tell the judge your road map for answering arguments (extend your own, counter theirs, then voter issues).
- Focus on extending your evidence.
- If your opponents forget to mention an argument, tell the judge that
- Pick the 3 main issues that have been most emphasized throughout the round- argue why you win each one.
- The last voter issue should be the value/ value criterion clash
- Shed the round- tell the judge what the case boils down to and why that means they have to vote for you

Goals for Each Speech: Part 3

Second Affirmative Rebuttal (3 min) - “2AR”

- Roadmap: “I will be clarifying some points and moving on to voter issues”
- Pick the points that were talked about the most during rounds that the judge should vote for in your favor.
- “There are 3 reasons why I win today’s round...”
- Use personal words: “Judge,” “You”
- “Judge, what this case comes down to is ...”
- Do impact calculus!

Both sides have equal total speaking time (13 minutes) but that time is divided differently. Since affirmative gets the first and last word, negative gets two longer, less rushed opportunities to rebut the opponent.

Cross Examination (CX)

Types of Questions

- **Clarification of Evidence**
 - What pieces of evidence did you use for your second contention?
 - What credentials does your author have? Why should we trust this source?
 - When was this article written? Does it take into consideration the pandemic that hit in 2020?
- **Understanding Impacts**
 - What is the impact of your first contention?
 - Why would an economic hit matter? Won't it eventually repair itself?
 - What is the probability of war? How serious is this risk?
- **Framing**
 - What is the end goal of the decision? To save lives or save the economy?
 - What should we prioritize?

Weighing Impacts

Impact and Value Comparison

Comparing Impacts and Values

Timeframe	Explains why your impact is going to happen first and why that matters in relation to another impact that is delayed.
Magnitude	Involves how intense the impact is.
Probability	Explains why your impact is more likely to actually happen.
Reversibility	Demonstrates why your impact will last forever or have long lasting impacts, whereas your opponents can be easily fixed.
Scope	Involves how broad your impact is.

Proud Partner of the Richmond Region Speech & Debate Initiative

