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### 2010 Youth Forum
Getting Acquainted  
July 27: 10:30 – 12:00

**Duration:** 90 min

**Training objectives:**
- To help the trainers and students learn each other’s names
- To help the trainers and students get to know something about each other’s background
- To help trainers get a sense of the strengths and weaknesses of each student

**Materials:**

**Session outline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30 minutes | Five word introduction speech | 1. Assign students to come up with five words which give some information about them or describe each one of them in some way. These words can relate to likes, dislikes, activities, hobbies, sports, family, trips, where you’ve lived, etc.  
  2. Let each one of them write the five words on a sheet of paper to be handed at the beginning of class tomorrow.  
  3. Once the papers are put together, randomly pick up any volunteer and request him or her to move in front of the room and tell the class a little about each of the words he or she wrote.  
  4. Student should begin his or her speech by telling the class his or her name. |           |
| 60 minutes | Further Ice Breaker Activity | Select other icebreaker from those provided or invent your own.                                                                                                                                         |           |
GETTING THE BEST FROM FIRST TIME SPEAKERS

According to Bob Jones of Canby High School, Oregon, giving a speech for the first time can be a scary experience. To break off this fear, icebreakers are handy in helping novice speakers get started; establishing a positive speaking environment and teaching some basic elements of public speaking.

Note: To help establish a positive speaking experience it is demanded that speakers also be good listeners. No one is allowed to make fun of or disturb a speaker. The whole class is expected to applaud in a supportive way for all speakers.

a) Five word introduction

This speech is a way for you to introduce yourself to an audience. The following simple steps offer some useful insights on how to proceed:

i. Assign students to come up with five words which give some information about them or describe each one of them in some way. These words can relate to likes, dislikes, activities, hobbies, sports, family, trips, where you’ve lived, etc.

ii. Let each one of them write the five words on a sheet of paper to be handed at the beginning of class tomorrow.

iii. Once the papers are put together, randomly pick up any volunteer and request him or her to move in front of the room and tell the class a little about each of the words he or she wrote.

iv. Student should begin his or her speech by telling the class his or her name.
b) Personal experience speech

Requirements

1. The speech must be brief and concise between one to three minutes.
2. One can start the speech with a story, a joke or proverb. But avoid saying “My speech is about.”
3. At the end of the story one can make a summary statement e.g. no speech in class may advocate or promote the use of drugs, alcohol or hatred.

Organization

1. Plan the first sentence of the story.
2. Tell the important details: leave out unimportant or uninteresting details.
3. Plan the last sentence of the story.

NOTE: After all the speeches, debrief by discussing positive speaking elements displayed and identify areas to be worked on/improved without singling out any student.
GETTING ACQUAINTED AND EXAMPLES OF ICE BREAKERS

Ice breakers:

These are a great way to get a team focused, at ease with each other and energized with meaningful content and fun. Flexibility and creativity is required when applying any of these examples of icebreakers to suit a particular circumstance to reap the best possible outcomes from participants.

a) Questions

Each group member receives one slip of paper and writes down a general question. For example, “What’s your favourite movie?” Everyone then places his/her question in a bucket or hat. The hat or bucket then gets passed around the room and everyone has to answer the question they pick out.

b) 11.5 Things about Me

Number a piece of paper from 1-11 and add an additional 11.5 at the end. Team members should write down eleven facts about themselves. When they get to 11.5, they should write down something they wish to be or do in the future. Afterwards, participants tape the list to their backs. The entire group stands, mingles, and takes turns reading each other’s lists. This icebreaker can be a great conversation starter as people read about each other, or the reading can also be done silently to make the sharing less intimidating for participants.

c) Human Scrabble

Each team member is given a letter to post on his or her chest. The group must then form as many words as possible by lining themselves up in different configurations. The leader keeps track of all of the words on the board or flip chart. At the end, each person must make a sentence using one of the words from the activity.
d) All My Friends

This activity can help people get acquainted while getting them up and moving around. It is a variation on musical chairs. Everyone sits in a circle, except for one person who stands in the middle. There are only enough chairs for the people who are sitting. The person in the centre begins the game by saying something that all the participants might (or might not) have in common. For example, "All my friends wear sneakers." At that point, all who are wearing sneakers must get up and move to a different chair. The person in the centre goes to a vacant chair, if he or she can. One person is left standing. That person then chooses the next characteristic and calls it out.

e) The Name Game

Everyone sits around in a circle. Each person says his/her name and one characteristic that describes him/her that starts with the first letter of his/her name. For example, Tim might say “Talented Tim” or “Truthful Tim.” Have the next person repeat the last name-characteristic combination and then add his/her own. Keep going until the last person has to repeat all the name-characteristic combinations.
“Animal Chain”
Equipment: none
Duration: **10-15 min.**

Here is the description of activity:

1. You moderate the game and tell the students to stand or sit in a circle

2. Teacher begins the game, saying her name and the name of an animal with the 1st letter of her name. (For example, I say: "Students, my name is Zarifa and my animal is Zebra". Then the student next to her continues; 1st of all he repeats the teacher's name and her animal, then he offers his own variant, for example, Zarifa-Zebra, Said-Snake)

3. The game continues in this way, next student says: Zarifa-Zebra, Said-Snake, Elmira-Elephant.

4. The rest of the game continues in the same way and the last student must say everybody's names and their animals.

5. In the process if someone forgets the names, leaves the game. (goes out from the circle)

Some tips for the activity:

1. Keep in mind that there can be a situation that the students couldn't find the name of an animal suitable to the 1st letter of their names, so that's why, teacher must be ready for this and can give hints or even suggestions.

2. Give an explanation to the pupils before beginning the game.

3. It is better to give few seconds to think about the names of the animals.

4. Remind the students whose turn it is, is it right or wrong.
“Web”
Equipment: thread ball
Duration: 10-15 min.

Here is the step by step method of carrying out the “Web” activity:

1. Ask the students to remember all the words that can describe transport.

2. All the students are asked to come up to the white-board (it is one of the main advantages of this activity – you can involve and ask all your students simultaneously!).

3. Take out a ball of thread and announce the topic: “The Traveler’s Story”.

4. Take the end of the thread and begin the story: “Once upon a time there lived an old traveler.”

5. Throw the ball to one of the students and ask him to tell the second sentence. Keep the end of the thread in your hands so that the thread stretch out from you to your student.

6. The student think of his sentence, voice it and throw the ball to another student (he was allowed to choose any student he wanted) still keeping some part of the thread.

7. The children go on throwing the thread to one another till their story is finished.

Here are some tips for the activity:

1. Allocate the classroom for the children.

2. Watch that all the students don’t forget to keep their part of the thread.

3. Don’t let your students throw the ball till they build a correct sentence.

4. Follow that every child got his turn to answer.
### 2010 Youth Forum

**Topic Overview**

**July 27: 12:30 - 14:00**

**Duration:** 90 min

**Training objectives:**
At the end of this session, the group should create:

- A list of possible definitions of ambiguous terms in the topic;
- A list of areas for debate into which the topic might be divided.
- Assignments for research into each of the topic areas.

**Materials:**
Flip Charts

**Session outline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Ice Breaker</td>
<td>Use any icebreaker to begin the session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>Defining terms of the topic</td>
<td>Discuss the following topics regarding definition of the topic:</td>
<td>Flip Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the key terms in the motion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How should each term be defined?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How is each of the terms distinct from other similar terms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are these definitions reasonable ones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 min</td>
<td>Divide the topic into areas for debate</td>
<td>Based on the definitions created in the first half of the session, lead a discussion on how the topic might be broken into different areas for debate. For instance:</td>
<td>Flip Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Geographic areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Particular countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Indigenous peoples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Assignment</td>
<td>Write one or two possible arguments on each of the different areas of debate on the topic. So there should be a minimum of five arguments from each student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010 Youth Forum
Key Issues about the Topic

Duration: 90 min

Training objectives:
• Create a list of key issues about each of the topic areas created in the previous session.
• Create a research agenda for developing a case
• Create a research agenda for developing negative arguments

Materials:
Flip Chart

Session outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 minutes| Define Issue | • An issue is any major point in a debate. They can be arguments raised in the affirmative case or arguments raised by the negative to oppose the case.  
  • Ordinarily an issue is thought of as an argument so substantial that the debate might turn on it. | Flip Chart   |
| 60 minutes| Create a list of key issues | Start with the list of topic areas created in the previous session  
• Create a list of issues that might be raised within each of the topic areas.  
• The list should include things thing like:  
  • What are current policies associated with this topic area?  
  • What are problems associated these policies  
  • What actions might be taken to solve these problems  
  • What are the potential disadvantages to these actions | Flip Chart   |
| 25 minutes| Create a research agenda based on the key issues | Research agendas should mirror the key issues identified earlier in the session:  
• Current policies  
• Problems these policies were meant to solve  
• Problems created by these policies  
• Potential disadvantages to these policies  
In research,  
Prefer quantitative over qualitative data  
Historical analysis  
Keep note of change in leadership  
Try to identify key advocates  
Keep in mind stakeholders who are not being represented | Flip Chart   |
|          | Next assignment | Fulfill your research agenda created in class.                                                                                                                   |             |
Constructing an Argument and Interpreting the Topic

July 28: 9:30 – 11:00

Duration: 90 min (30 for Constructing an Argument, 60 for Interpreting the Topic)

Training objectives:
- Each team will demonstrate proficiency with basic argument construction
- Each team will create an interpretation of the topic suitable as a starting point for constructing a case
- Each team will create a draft of a plan of action consistent with the topic.

Materials:
- Handout: Constructing an argument
- Handout: Interpreting the topic

Session outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Introductory activity</td>
<td>Begin discussion with engagement of a current political issue where framing is especially significant. Suggestions might include: - Farm to urban migration - Cultural problems related to migration - Economic problems related to migration The goal is to elicit responses across the political spectrum and identify the divergent ways each side uses an interpretation of the issue to support their political outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Discussion of the principles of argument construction</td>
<td>Three-step process, with each step connected by the word “because” and provision of reasons that support the logical inference: - Assertion - Reason - Evidence</td>
<td>See handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Students identify the components of an argument in a copy of a popular press editorial and the group discusses its conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td>A copy of any recent editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Each team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>See handout</td>
<td>See handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Discussion of the principles of topic interpretation</td>
<td>See handout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Each team creates a topic interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Each team creates an outline of a plan of action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Each team identifies a research agenda to construct a case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next Assignment</td>
<td>Each team should pursue the research agenda identified in the last objective, completing case construction with evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Principles of Interpreting a Motion**

I. Define any ambiguous terms

II. Outline a framework within which the debate will take place.
   
   A. This framework should be consistent with the motion
   
   B. This framework ordinarily will include a proposed action that the proposition team will defend.
      1. Actor: Who should take this action? Person, group, state, international organization, etc.
      2. Action: What policy should this actor undertake?

III The framework should be a “reasonable” one for debate according to the following criteria:

   A. Does the framework encourage debate on the substantive issues surrounding the motion?

   B. Would an intelligent and competent person agree that this framework is a reasonable approximation of the motion.
Constructing a Simple Argument
Three Parts of an Argument

Assertion: a simple statement announcing the claim the debater intends to support.

Reason: a statement providing reasons the audience or the judge should believe the assertion.

Evidence: information that supports the reason.
Constructing a Complex Argument
Three Parts of an Argument

Case for a Proposition

Argument 1

Because

Argument 2

Because

Argument 3

Because
2010 Youth Forum
Case Construction Concepts and Practice
July 28, 11:30 – 13:00

Duration: 90 min

Training objectives:
• To develop an understanding of two methods of constructing an affirmative case
• To begin development of complete outline of an affirmative case for each team

Materials:

Session outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Introductory exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Methods of case construction</td>
<td>Using a combination of lecture and discussion, cover both the comparative advantages and need—plan—benefits methods of constructing an affirmative case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 minutes</td>
<td>Case construction work</td>
<td>Work with each team to develop a complete outline of an affirmative case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next session</td>
<td>The next session will continue working on the affirmative cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2010 Youth Forum**  
Case Construction Practice  
**July 28, 14:30 – 16:00**

**Duration:** 90 min

**Training objectives:**
- To complete work on constructing each team’s affirmative case
- To develop a research agenda for discovering evidence for each team’s case
- If time permits, to begin the process of research to discover evidence.

**Materials:** Flip charts

**Session outline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Introductory activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 minutes</td>
<td>Case construction work</td>
<td>Complete the development of each team’s case following either the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comparative advantages or need—plan—benefits format.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop an outline that contains all of the points that the case needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to contain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Develop a research agenda</td>
<td>Go through the case with each team and identify what evidence is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a plan for the students to find that evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If time permits</td>
<td>Begin research process</td>
<td>If time permits, help the students begin the process of identifying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evidence for their arguments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date Due</td>
<td>Cases must be complete by the next morning in order to participate in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>their practice debates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creating a Case for Banning Import of Goods Produced by Child Labor

By Robert Trapp and Kevin Bell*

As this issue of IDEBATE Magazine goes to press, we are in the process of creating the curriculum to be used at the 2010 Youth Forum in Zeeland. The curriculum will consist of two interrelated elements: lessons about the process of argumentation and debate and lessons about the debate topics. These two elements reflect the dual objectives of the IDEA Youth Forum: to teach critical thinking through argumentation and debate and to teach about important global issues.

IDEA is committed to teaching critical thinking and we believe that argumentation and debate training is one way to fulfill that commitment. As a result, the IDEA YF curriculum will focus on several elements of the process of argumentation and debate which are most related to critical thinking. These lessons will include topics like: the nature of argumentation, effective evidence, sound reasoning, and avoiding fallacies.

Other lessons will focus on the substance of the debate topics. As we are committed to studying the process of argumentation and debate, we also are committed to providing opportunities to learn about important global issues. The two topics for the Karl Popper Debate Championship at the Youth Forum are:

“Countries should ban the import of goods produced by child labor.”

and

“In some cases, juveniles should be tried as adults.”

The YF curriculum will include lessons about each of these important issues. These lessons will include considerations of the problems raised by child labor and juvenile crime, the status of proposals to solve these problems, and the advantages and disadvantages of these proposals.

Other lessons in the curriculum will focus on the intersection of the process of debate and the substance of the debate topic. For instance: methods to create a case for each of the topics and methods to suggest arguments in opposition to proposals stemming from each of the topics. This part of the curriculum focusing on the intersection of debate and substance is perhaps the most important part of the YF curriculum because it aims at both of the objectives mentioned earlier.

The remainder of this essay will illustrate one such lesson: how to create a case for banning the import of goods produced by child labor.

In these remaining sections, we will discuss interpreting the resolution and creating a case for the resolution. Then we will provide examples of how a case for the resolution can be built using two common methods of case construction.

* Robert Trapp is professor at Willamette University and is Curriculum Director for the International Debate Education Association. Kevin Bell is a student participant in the Willamette University Debate Union.
Interpret the Proposition

Before you can begin to debate, you’ll need to decide how your team will interpret the resolution. Debate resolutions are often general or abstract statements that can be narrowed or interpreted – legitimately – in many different ways.

Consider the following resolution to be debated at the 2010 Youth Forum:

*Countries should ban the import of goods produced by child labor.*

The interpretation of this topic might focus on three terms in the proposition: “countries,” “goods,” and “child labor.” Your interpretation of these three terms is important because it would be very difficult to support an argument that all countries should ban the import of all goods produced by all types of child labor. Because you as the affirmative team have a limited amount of time to present your case, you will need to focus your arguments.

As the affirmative team, you can choose to define the topic broadly or narrowly, as long as your interpretation is a reasonable one. You’ll probably want to start by focusing on the terms suggested above. For instance, you might choose to focus on certain groups of countries (such as the EU) or on particular countries (such as ones who are serious offenders of child labor). Then you might want to focus on the type of goods imported (e.g. textiles) and on the type of child labor (e.g. children under the age of 18).

Develop a Case for the Proposition

Once you’ve decided how to interpret the resolution, you’ll need to develop a case. Stated simply, a case is a proposed plan and one or more arguments to support the plan.

Propose Your Plan

Your plan needs to include at least two elements: an actor and an action. Sometimes the plan also may include some additional elements.

The actor is simply the group who will implement the action you are proposing. Your plan to ban the import of goods produced by child labor must include an “actor;” the group, government, or other organization you think should enact your plan. You are free to select any country or group of countries as your actor as long as you can show those countries are capable of enacting your proposed plan.

After you describe the actor, you need to describe the action that you propose. This is the central point of your plan: What policy should the actor adopt? What action should the individual or group take?

Describe the action as specifically as you can. If you’re proposing that the actor ban all imports from countries that have had problems with child labor, describe how that actor will determine which countries those will be and how which goods should be banned. Should the actor ban goods produced from materials collected by children? Should the actor restrict
companies who have been accused of using child labor? Consider the timeline: How long will the actor have to enact your plan? Will it happen gradually, over 10 years, or immediately?

After you describe your proposed action, you may need to include additional elements you think will strengthen your plan. For example, how will your plan be funded and enforced?

Once you have described the action you are proposing, you need to develop one or more arguments to support that plan. The combination of the plan and the arguments supporting it are called your case.

Support Your Plan

Your job now is to create the best arguments in favor of your plan. As you go through this process, you may identify weaknesses in your plan that you want to repair. Don’t hesitate to revise your plan.

If your team doesn’t have much debate experience, you can select from two common types of cases: a need-plan-benefits case or a comparative advantage case. If you’re an experienced debate team, you’re welcome to use one of these or another type of debate case.

Choose a Type of Affirmative Case for Your Debate

There are many ways to argue in favor of the resolution. This guide will explain two of the most common: the need-plan-benefits case and the comparative advantages case.

The need-plan-benefits case focuses on the need for change. If you choose this type of case, you’ll focus on a compelling need. Then, you’ll show how your plan will meet the need. Your job is to demonstrate that your plan is practical and will work in the real world.

By contrast, the comparative advantage case focuses on the advantages of a new action compared to the present course of action. The main objective of a comparative advantage case is to highlight the greater advantage that could be achieved by using this new plan rather than the current one.

The next two sections will describe the two kinds of affirmative cases using an example related to the child labor resolution.
Alternative I: Need–Plan–Benefits Case

As the name implies, this kind of case involves demonstrating a need for a change, providing a plan to fulfill that need, and showing the benefits of the plan.

Step 1: Describe the Need

In the need-plan-benefits case, the focus is on the need. Your first task, therefore, is to establish that need. You should clearly identify one, two, or at most three problems or needs. In developing each of these problems, you should consider the following questions:

What needs exist for changing the current policy?
What problems or harms exist in the present system?
What is the extent and severity of those needs?
Why is the current policy unable to answer those needs?

For example, you might argue:

*In the status quo, children produce a number of products, especially textiles. This is bad for a number of reasons: it prevents children from getting a proper education, violates their human rights, forces them into sweatshop labor conditions from a young age, and reinforces a cycle of poverty in which they may be trapped for the rest of their lives. Current policies have not fixed the problem, as nations are still providing markets for goods produced by child labor, continuing to make the practice profitable. The raw cotton used for clothing that is picked in Uzbekistan, for example, is often picked by children as young as ten.*

Step 2: Present Your Plan

Present your plan for combating child labor. Show how your plan answers the needs you named. For example, your plan might be something like the following:

*All member nations of the United Nations will ban the import of textiles made from cotton traceable to fields that employ children in cotton production.*

You will notice that although this plan is brief and simple, it contains the two essential elements of a plan: an actor (members of the United Nations) and an action (ban import of textiles which are produced using child labor).

Step 3: Argue the Benefits

What benefits will your plan have? How are those benefits related specifically to the needs you named? In other words, the benefit of your plan should be that it meets the need that you outlined in Step 1.

The benefits that your team identifies should be parallel to the problems that you suggested in Step 1. If you identified 2 needs (or problems) in Step 1, then you should present 2 benefits.
in Step 3. The first benefit should demonstrate how the plan meets the first need (or solves the first problem) and the second benefit should illustrate that the plan remedies the second need.

In arguing each of the benefits, you should answer two questions:

*How will the plan alleviate the problem?* Show that your plan will do something the current system cannot. Don’t assume that your audience will make the connections: explain exactly how the plan alleviates the problem.

*What will be the beneficial effect of alleviating this problem?* Don’t just say that the plan will alleviate the problem. Show the real and tangible benefits of alleviating the problem.

For instance, you might suggest:

*Banning the import of child-produced cotton will eliminate the profitability of using child labor, and force landowners to cease that practice. This action provides advantages to children in terms of access to education, leisure, and their overall quality of life.*

**Alternative II: Comparative Advantage Case**

With the comparative advantage method, the plan comes first, followed by an explanation of the advantages of the plan. The focus of the debate is not on the relationship between the need and the plan, but on the differences between the advantages of your plan as opposed to the present system. Your principle argument is that your plan brings about significantly better advantages than the status quo can produce.

**Step 1: Present Your Plan**

Present your plan for banning the import of products made using child labor as an alternative to the current policy. The plan for a comparative advantages case is essentially the same as a plan for a need-plan-benefits case. For instance,

*The member nations of the United Nations shall ban the import of cotton clothing made from cotton produced with the use of child labor.*

**Step 2: Show that your plan will create an effect the current system cannot create**

What effect will your plan create? Why doesn’t the present system create this effect? Why is the present system incapable of creating this effect?

For instance, you may argue:

*The status quo is incapable of solving the problem of child labor, as it only bans products that are manufactured with child labor, leaving out crucial steps of the production process, including the collection of raw materials.*
The affirmative plan will cause the use of child labor to become unprofitable for landowners who are currently employing children, as the market for their labor will dry up without access member nations of the United Nations. After this point, landowners who currently employ children will have to employ adults to ensure their continued economic survival.

Step 3: Establish Your Plan’s Advantages

Show that the effect you established in Step 2 has desirable consequences. An effect could be desirable if it is associated with values we aspire to, or values that are arguably good values. Explain how advantages of your plan serve good values, whereas the values served by the status quo are less desirable.

For instance, you might argue:

The advantage of the affirmative plan is that it will prevent children from being driven into labor at a young age. It will also allow them to attain an education, and break the cycle of poverty that is reinforced by the use of child labor. The values of education and human rights are universal, and should be applied to all people, young and old.

By focusing on the process of argumentation and debate as well as on the substance of our two debate topics, the 2010 IDEA Youth Forum aims to pursue its dual objectives of teaching critical thinking along with teaching about some of the most critical issues facing the globe. This essay outlines one lesson that will be used at the Youth Forum, a lesson that integrates both of the dual objectives. We hope that many of you will be able to join us in Zeeland for this year’s Youth Forum. For those of you who are unable to do so, we hope that this and other lessons (which will be posted on IDEA’s website) will be educational and helpful as you continue your own pursuits.
Constructing a Case for a Proposition  
IDEA Youth Forum, Summer 2010

I. Principles of Constructing a Case

A. A case for the proposition is one or more arguments that support the framework presented by the team defending the proposition.

B. Two common methods of constructing a case:
   1. Comparative Advantages Case
   2. Need—Plan—Benefits Case

II. Comparative Advantages Case

A. Plan of action

   1. Who or what is the appropriate actor? Who or what should implement your plan?
   2. What specific actions do you propose?
   3. What other important details are needed? (Funding, enforcement, etc.)

B. Advantages

   1. Show that the current system cannot attain your advantages. Identify the source of the problem.
      a. What is the cause of the problem? (Who or what is to blame)?
      b. How is the cause of the problem associated with current policy? (Does the current policy contain gaps?)
         (Does the current policy contain barriers?)

   2. Show how your plan creates the advantages.

   3. Demonstrate the magnitude of the advantages.
      a. Quantitatively
      b. Qualitatively
III. Need—Plan—Benefits Case

A. Need: Is there a need for a change in policy?
   1. Identify the problem.
   2. Demonstrate the magnitude of the problem.
      a. Quantitatively
      b. Qualitatively
   3. Identify the source of the problem.
      a. What is the cause of the problem? (Who or what is to blame?)
      b. How is the cause of the problem associated with current policy?

B. Plan—Present your plan of action
   1. Who or what is the appropriate actor? Who or what should implement your plan?
   2. What specific actions do you propose?
   3. What other important details are needed? (Funding, enforcement, etc.)

C. Benefits—Show how your plan satisfied the need for a change
   1. Show that the current system cannot attain your advantages.
   2. Show how your plan creates the advantages.
   3. Demonstrate the magnitude of the benefits.
      a. Quantitatively
      b. Qualitatively
2010 Youth Forum
Negative Strategy Concepts
Constructing Negative Arguments
June 29, 9:00 – 11:30

Duration: 90 min

Training objectives:
- To develop an understanding of potential negative stances
- To develop an understanding of typical negative arguments
- To develop a list of potential negative arguments
- If time permits, to begin developing negative arguments

Materials:

Session outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Introductory activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Potential negative stances</td>
<td>Using a combination of lecture and discussion, help students develop an understanding of the three potential negative stances.</td>
<td>See handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Typical negative arguments</td>
<td>Using a combination of lecture and discussion, help students develop an understanding of the four typical negative arguments.</td>
<td>See handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>Brainstorm potential negative arguments</td>
<td>Using brainstorming techniques develop a list of potential negative arguments. Reduce that list to a few arguments that students can develop.</td>
<td>Flip charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If time permits</td>
<td>Develop negative arguments</td>
<td>Starting with the list of negative arguments, help students develop individual arguments. Each argument should be outlined as completely as it needs to be in presentation</td>
<td>Flip charts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Negative Strategies for Debating About Policies

The negative can use three specific strategies, either singly or in combination, to attack a need-plan-benefits case. The team can defend the status quo, defend a policy other than the status quo, and attack the affirmative plan.

When attacking the affirmative’s case, the negative needs to keep in mind that they are defending a policy that enjoys a privileged position of presumption. The concept of presumption means maintaining current policies until someone makes a case that another policy is a better option. The concept is logical because change requires effort and involves risk. Thus, the benefits must outweigh the potential dangers to convince people to try change. The negative must keep before the audience the advantage associated of maintaining presumption, then the team can begin to develop other strategies for debating against changes in policy.

Defending the Status Quo

Defending the status quo is the strategy that most clearly benefits from the concept of presumption. If the negative team defends the present system, they capitalize on the idea that we should presume the system should remain until a better alternative is presented. The negative has at least three options in defense of the status quo:

1. Argue that the problem does not exist or is not as serious as the affirmative suggests. Only rarely will the negative be able to prove the complete absence of a problem in the present system. Nevertheless, the negative might provide substantial evidence that the problem is not as important or widespread as the affirmative team suggested. The negative might argue that there is no point in implementing a plan (spending time, effort, money, taking unnecessary risk) designed to solve a minor problem (one that does not affect a lot of people or whose effects are not serious).

2. Arguing that the present system can solve the problem. The negative also can argue (and support with evidence) that the current system will solve the problem given sufficient time. Consequently, adopting a new plan cannot be justified. The team can argue that solving complex problems requires a long time and, consequently, we cannot yet judge the success of the current system.

3. Argue that the affirmative team has identified the wrong cause. By arguing that their opponents have identified a wrong cause of the problem, the negative is able to suggest that the affirmative plan will not solve the problem. In the process of arguing about the cause of the problem, the negative needs to suggest that the present system can address the cause of the problem, while the affirmative plan cannot.

---

1 Excerpt from Discovering the World Through Debate
Defending a policy other than the status quo

The negative can also consider defending a plan other than the status quo. The team should choose this option when the status quo has more problems than the negative wishes to defend or when the negative can suggest some changes or additions to existing policies that are superior to the status quo and to the affirmative’s plan. In using this option, the negative employs two strategies: advocating minor repairs and presenting a counter plan.

Advocating minor repairs to the present system is an alternative that the negative might choose when the present system is structurally and conceptually sound but needs some minor alterations. If, for instance, the negative team believes that the failure of the status quo is the result of a lack of resources, they should advocate adding those resources.

When advocating minor repairs, the negative needs to show how these are more desirable than the affirmative plan. Team members could show that minor repairs solve the problem as well or better than the affirmative plan. Alternatively, the negative could demonstrate that although minor repairs are not as effective as the affirmative’s solution, they avoid some very serious disadvantage that the affirmative plan would create.

The strategy of proposing minor repairs has the advantage of allowing the negative team to advocate improvements to the present system while simultaneously maintaining the advantage of presumption. Because the changes they are advocating are minor, they do not entail the serious risks of the affirmative’s plan.

Presenting a counterplan is an alternative when the negative wants to advocate a plan that is conceptually different from both the present system and the affirmative plan. When presenting a counterplan, the negative agrees that the status quo must be changed but argues that the affirmative’s plan is not the best solution. Instead, the negative presents an alternative, their counterplan. If the negative decides to present a counterplan, it must satisfy two requirements:

1. Conform to all of the requirements of an affirmative plan discussed earlier in the chapter. Like the affirmative plan, a counterplan to contain an actor and an action may also need to include some of nonessential elements such as funding or enforcement.

2. Be an alternative, not an addition, to the affirmative plan. The counterplan can be advocated as a substitute for the affirmative plan in two ways. One way is to show that the counterplan and the affirmative plan are mutually exclusive—that their coexistence is logically impossible.

   For example, when debating the ICC resolution, the negative might recommend abolishing the Court rather than strengthening it, arguing that the concept of an international body administering justice is a bad idea and that the ICC should be abandoned. Thus, the negative can argue that the plan to strengthen the ICC and the counterplan to abolish the ICC are mutually exclusive.

   The second way to show the superiority of the counter-plan is to argue that it achieves the advantages of the affirmative plan while avoiding some of the disadvantages\(^2\). Using our

\[4. \text{Technically, the negative ought to establish that the net benefits of the counterplan alone are greater than the net benefits of the counterplan plus the affirmative plan. However, as this}\]
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example, a negative team might propose that sovereign nations establish courts to try war crimes rather than having the ICC hear the cases. This counterplan and the affirmative plan are not mutually exclusive because they could be enacted simultaneously. Strengthening the ICC could be done simultaneously with establishing national courts to try war crimes. However, if the negative were able to argue that their counterplan would achieve all of the affirmative advantages and avoid some of the disadvantages of interfering with national sovereignty, the negative would have established that the counterplan should be a substitute for the affirmative, not just an addition to it.

Attacking the Plan

The negative can make a variety of arguments against the affirmative plan. Three of the most common are: the plan will not work, the plan will not solve the problem, and the plan will cause disadvantages.

1. **The affirmative plan will not work.** A plan might not work because the agent chosen to implement it will be unable to do so because the steps suggested by the affirmative are unrealistic or because the plan is too expensive and no funds are available to finance it. Often arguments against implementing the affirmative plan are too insubstantial to cause a judge to reject the plan. As a result, these kinds of argument frequently need to be combined with other arguments against the affirmative plan.

2. **The affirmative plan will not solve the problem.** This argument is frequently combined with an argument that we discussed earlier: the affirmative has identified the wrong cause. Sometimes the negative can suggest that the affirmative plan will not solve the problem because it will eliminate only one of many causes. For instance, the negative might say that the ineffectiveness of the ICC is but one cause of the increased rate of war crimes and terrorism. The negative could then document several other potential causes (lack of coordinated intelligence, failure of international coalitions, etc.) that the affirmative plan does not eliminate. The negative would then have to show that the causes not addressed by the affirmative plan are substantial enough that the problem would remain.

Arguing that the plan does not solve the problem is a potentially strong argument and one that under certain circumstances can be sufficient to cause the judges to reject the affirmative plan regardless of other arguments in the debate. More often, however, the argument does not preclude the affirmative plan solving *some part* of the problem. If so, the affirmative can then argue that at least their plan does a better job of solving the problem than the present system. As a result, the argument that the affirmative plan will not solve the problem is frequently coupled with an argument about the disadvantages of the plan.

3. **The affirmative plan will cause disadvantages.** Using this strategy, the negative should demonstrate that the affirmative’s plan will cause more harm than good and that these harms are significant. One potential disadvantage that might be linked to almost any plan to strengthen the ICC, for example, involves the risk to national sovereignty. To develop such an argument, the negative might begin by demonstrating a relationship between the affirmative plan and national sovereignty. The team might argue that under the present
system, decisions about prosecution of terrorists and war criminals rightly belong to individual nations. Shifting that right to an international body will erode sovereignty. The negative might then show how the erosion of sovereignty in one area might ultimately lead to erosion of sovereignty in other areas.

Having demonstrated the link between the affirmative plan and loss of sovereignty, the negative then should present a compelling argument explaining why such loss is a significant problem. That argument could be that national sovereignty is the best way to support and improve human rights efforts in the developing world. As we said earlier, creating a disadvantage is potentially one of the strongest ways to argue against an affirmative plan.

Summary of Arguing About a Simple Policy Proposition

Debating about policy cannot occur in the absence of debating about values. We make choices about our actions based on our values. In discussing the negative’s response to the policy proposition, we distinguished three main strategies: arguing that there is no need for change (therefore, the affirmative’s plan and advantages are irrelevant or unnecessary) as no problem exists or the status quo will eventually solve the problem; offering an counterplan; or challenging the affirmative plan by exposing its inefficiency or the further problems it would cause. Teams preparing to debate propositions of policy should keep in mind that they have flexibility about which strategy or strategies they use in their debates.
Constructing a Case to Oppose a Proposition
IDEAYouth Forum, 2010

• The opposition team should do more than oppose, they should stand for something.
  • Explicitly defend the present system
  • Defend the present system in principles and offer minor repairs
  • Offer as counter proposal
• Typical Opposition Arguments
  • No need to change
  • Affirmative (Government) plan will not work
  • Disadvantages of the plan is wrong
  • Alternative plan of action (counter proposal) is better
• No need for change
  • Show the present system is solving the problem with incremental steps
  • Show that the effects described by the Affirmative (Government) are not occurring.
• Show that the plan will not work.
  • Show that the plan does not eliminate a necessary cause of the problem. The relationship between the present system and the effect is coincidental, not causal.
  • Show that the plan is not sufficient to solve the problem or to produce the advantage.
• Disadvantages of the affirmative plan
  • Describe some feature of the affirmative plan.
  • Relate that feature to some effect.
  • Show how that effect is worse than the problem the affirmative claims to solve.
• Show a counterproposal is better than the affirmative proposal.
  • Present an alternative course of action.
  • Show why your counterproposal is a true alternative – Why should your alternative preclude the affirmative’s plan of action.
  • Does the counterproposal solve the problem outlined by the affirmative?
  • Does the counterproposal avoid some of the disadvantages of the affirmative’s plan?
2010 Youth Forum  
Limited Preparation Debate  
Thursday, July 29, 14:30 – 15:30

**Duration:** 90 min

**Training objectives:**
At the end of this session, the group should create:
- A list of possible resolutions under the topic area;
- A list of possible affirmative cases related to the list of resolutions.
- A list of arguments related to each of these potential affirmative cases.
- A list of negative arguments that relate to each of the potential affirmative cases.

**Materials:**
Flip Chart

**Session outline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Ice Breaker</td>
<td>Use any icebreaker to begin the session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Predicting possible topics within the topic area</td>
<td>Discuss the following questions regarding the topic area:</td>
<td>Flip Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the key terms in the topic area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How should each term be defined?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What is the socio-economic/political environment in which the topic currently exists?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there any important pieces of information on which the topic will be built?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are predictable resolutions for the topic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Brainstorm a list of possible resolutions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce the number of possible resolutions and create a list of the most probable resolutions for debate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>Discuss possible affirmative and negative positions</td>
<td>Based on the discussion from the first half of the session, what are reasonable positions that the affirmative and negative teams should be prepared to debate. For instance:</td>
<td>Flip chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Who are the important actors in the topic area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the current actors doing that are both beneficial and problematic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there other parties that have interests in the topic area that are not currently being engaged?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Which policies have governments used to affect the topic area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 30 min | Discuss the work from the previous session so that all students have access to the same ideas | Based on the discussion from the small groups, everyone should share their work. For instance:
| | | • What are possible affirmative cases? What are possible plans and arguments to support these cases?
| | | • What are possible negative arguments? What are some possible arguments that the negative can use to argue against each of the affirmative cases? |

| Next assignment | Students should prepare individually for each of the cases/negative positions with a focus on examples and data that comes most naturally to each student’s background |
2010 Youth Forum
Cross-Examination
Various Times

**Duration:** 1.30 hours

**Objectives:**

**General**
- Understand the format and purpose of CX in different debate traditions
- Become aware of the different set of burdens for asking and answering questions
- Learn to use CX as an effective rhetorical tool

**Practical**
- Practice asking questions with a specific goal in mind
- Use teamwork to ask and answer questions more effectively
- Manage aggressive behaviour during CX
- Identify ‘secret goal’ of questions and use it to strengthen your argument

**Session outline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Introductory exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>Principles of Cross-</td>
<td>Lab leader presents:</td>
<td>Cross-Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>examination</td>
<td>• What is cross-examination?</td>
<td>Handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Purposes of cross-examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Asking Questions in cross-examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Answering Questions in cross-examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 minutes</td>
<td>Cross-examination Exercises</td>
<td>Select 3 of the 6 exercises provided</td>
<td>Cross-Examination Exercises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction to cross-examination

In this outline:
- What is cross-examination?
- Purposes of cross-examination
- Asking Questions in cross-examination
- Answering Questions in cross-examination

A. What is cross-examination?
1. exchange of questions and answers
2. ground rules
   The two debaters face the front of the room
   CX is still a presentation to the audience
   Polite, courteous exchange of questions and answers

B. Purposes of cross examination
1. Get more info
2. To clarify an argument
3. To clarify an argument for the audience
4. To commit someone to an argument
5. To bring out information useful in building your own arguments
6. To establish a plan of refutation
7. To identify inadequacies in argument
8. to undermine the opponent’s credibility
9. to enhance your own impression and credibility

Basic cross-examination: Ask questions of your opponents to clarify and get information you can use in subsequent speeches. This is not a time to make your own arguments. You can suggest your arguments through the questions you ask. For example, it would be in bad taste to say, your arguments about the protestors in Bangkok is completely wrong, want to know how you’re wrong?

D. Asking Questions in Cross-examination
1. Ask questions, do not give speeches
   Goal: elicit statements rather than lock the respondent into a “yes” or “no”. Demanding one-word answers is unfair because it doesn’t give the person to answer fully, honestly, and clearly.

2. Stay in control
   Goal: giving them enough time to fully answer the question is important, but it is your right to politely cut them off if they are being long winded or not answering your question. You also do not need to answer questions.

3. Pursue specific information
   Goal: Clear and direct questions. Long winded questions only waste time because you would probably have to repeat yourself.
   With the time constraints, it would be efficient to pursue a specific line of questions.
4. Remain flexible
Goal: still have a productive questioning session even if the debate is not going as you had hoped or thought it would. Prepare two or three lines of questions so you always have a backup plan.

5. Manage time
Goal: be aware of the time so you fit in the important questions you want answered. It is easy to get caught up in a vexing answer and forget about your time. But also effectively use most if not all of your time.

Last note: The most proficient questioners are those who are comfortable, are not afraid to take risks with their questions, and use a variety of techniques. As you gain more experience in cross-examination, you will feel more comfortable with different approaches (Discovering the World through Debate p.157).

E. Answering Questions in Cross-examination
1. Listen carefully
Goal: listen carefully to the question and the intent of the question. This helps be careful in responding so you don’t answer in a way that is damaging to your case.

2. Qualify Answers to Unfair questions
Goal: not be locked into answering questions that would force you to unfairly represent your arguments. For example, if the question asks you to choose answers A or B, you can suggest C as long as you don’t seem to be avoiding the question. But of course, don’t be annoying. If you disagree just for the sake of disagreeing, you do not endear yourself to the judge or audience.

3. Don’t be afraid to take a specific stance
Goal: your successful strong answers re-enforce the best of your arguments. Being clear in your answers are persuasive reminders of your key arguments.

4. Admit lack of understanding when appropriate
Goal: not get caught faking answers. If you don’t know the answer to the question, don’t be afraid to admit that you don’t know.

Last note: Strive to give honest answers in a polite and respectful manner (Discovering the World through Debate p. 158).


**2010 Youth Forum**  
**Style and Delivery**  
**Skills Lab: Various Times**

**Duration:** 90 min

**Training objectives:**
- To discuss the principles of style and delivery  
- To practice using voice to convey a message  
- To practice using appropriate body language to convey a message

**Materials:**  
Handout  
Selected paragraphs from one of the topic-related readings

**Session outline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Introductory activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Principles of style and delivery</td>
<td>Discuss selected items from the handout related to the principles of style and delivery.</td>
<td>Handout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 30 minutes| Practice use of voice to convey a message     | Give each student a different paragraph from one of the topic-related readings.  

Have each student read the paragraph aloud in a manner that best conveys its meaning according to the principles discussed earlier.  

| 30 Minutes| Practice use of body to convey a message     | Ask each student to sit in silence for 120 seconds. During that time, the students should do 2 things: 1) think of an event in their life which is especially memorable, and 2) recall that event in their mind so that it becomes so vivid that they can recall being in the actual event.  

Ask each student to describe that event to the rest of the lab group. Discuss the extent to which their body language presents this event in an especially memorable way.  

|             |                                               |                                                                                          |             |
Style and Delivery

1. General Principles of Style and Delivery
   • Overcoming Nervousness
     To be a better debater, you need to overcome nervousness and convey meaning in your communication.

     Public speaking can be a frightening experiences for most people, so we have words like “Stage fright”, “out of breath”, “a butterflies in the stomach” to describe this kind of meaning. We need to get some preparation of our bodies and minds for the speeches.

     Preparation of your body for overcoming nervousness

     Preparation of your mind for overcoming nervousness

   • Conveying Meaning in Your Communication
     Communication happens whenever someone places meaning on something. If you do something or say something and someone else thinks something about what you do or say, then it has meaning for them and communication has taken place, even though you may not have intended the meaning or been active with your actions or words. In fact, the meaning that the receiver of your message perceives might not be equivalent to what you want to send.

2. Delivery: Verbal and nonverbal manner in which you present your arguments.
   • The voice in Delivery
     • Volume
     • Tone
     • Rate
     • Pause
     • Articulation
     • Vocal Variety

   • The Body in Delivery (bearing)
     • Body control
     • Gestures
     • Eye contact
     • Facial expressions
3. **Style: concerned with the linguistic devices**
   - **Elements of Style**
     - Alliteration
     - Allusions, metaphors & analogies
     - Hyperbole & Personification
     - Repetition
     - Declarative Sentences
   - **The language that signals respect for the participants and the process of debating:**
     - When referring to fellow competitors
     - When refuting arguments
     - When referring to the subjects of arguments

   Above all, remember that there is a very human side to all arguments and a big part of effective delivery is helping your audience to feel like you are sharing ideas with them respectfully, but firmly.

4. **Using style and delivery to compliment your arguments.**
   - **CUE CARDS.**
     Do not write out your speech on cue cards. Debating is an exercise in lively interaction between two teams and between the teams and the audience, not in reading a speech. Use cue cards the same way you would use a prompt in a play, they are there for reference if you lose your spot.
   - **EYE CONTACT.**
     If you look at the audience you will hold their attention. If you spend your time reading from cue cards or looking at a point just above the audience's head they will lose concentration very quickly. When you're speaking directly at them, their minds will follow.
   - **VOICE.**
     There are many things you can do with your voice to make it effective. You must project so that you can be heard that does not mean you spend five minutes only speaking very loudly. Use volume, pitch and speed to emphasise important points in your speech.
   - **BODY LANGUAGE.**
     Your body is a tool for you to use. Make hand gestures deliberately and with confidence to compliment the information you have to share. Don't let your body show that you're nervous.
   - **NERVOUS HABITS.**
     Playing with your cue cards, pulling on a stray strand of hair, fiddling with your watch. Use your whole person to persuade, don't let any one thing detract from your ability to persuade the audience.
   - **RESPECT**
     Use language that signals respect for the participants and the process of debating. When referring to fellow competitors. When refuting arguments. When referring to the subjects of arguments
   - **SPEAKING CLEARLY, SWEET AND SIMPLE.**
**2010 Youth Forum**  
**Refutation**  
**Skills Lab: Various Times**

**Duration:** 90 min

**Training objectives:**
- To understand the principles of refutation
- To understand the four-step method of refutation
- To improve refutation techniques through practice

**Materials:**
- Handout
- Exercise

**Session outline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Introductory activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes</td>
<td>Principles of refutation</td>
<td>Lecture and discussion of the principles of refutation</td>
<td>Handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Four-step refutation method</td>
<td>Lecture and discussion on the four-step refutation process</td>
<td>Handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 minutes</td>
<td>Practice four step refutation</td>
<td>Follow instructions in attached exercise</td>
<td>Refutation exercise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Refutation Defined

- Refutation involves *criticizing arguments* opposing your own according to certain *standards of argument quality*.
- Refutation is a process in which all debaters (except the Prime Minster) will engage.

Standards of Argument Quality

- **Acceptability.**
  - Standard related to evidence
  - Is the evidence presented acceptable or believable?
- **Relevance.**
  - Standard related to reasoning
  - Is the evidence related to the claim?
- **Sufficiency.**
  - Standard related to reasoning
  - Is the evidence sufficient to support the claim?

Parts of an argument to refute

- **Evidence.** Is the evidence true or acceptable?
- **Reasoning.** Does the reasoning provide a proper connection between the evidence and the claim?
  - Does the reasoning demonstrate how the evidence is relevant to the claim?
  - Does the reasoning demonstrate how the evidence is sufficient to make the claim convincing?

Four-Step Refutation Process

- “They say. . .”
- “But I say. . .”
- “Because. . .”
- “Therefore. . .”
Refutation Exercise

The Exercise:

Parts 1 – 5 of this exercise should be done by a group of students led by a teacher using a chalkboard or a whiteboard.

Individuals rather than groups should do part 6. Allow students to give short speeches (1 minute) in which they engage in refutation by following the four-stem method.

1: Identify the argument to be refuted.
   For instance, take one of the arguments from the exercise about creating arguments for a proposition: “Governments should preserve rural life.”

2: Identify the support for that argument.
   For instance: “China's rural population lacks basic health care.”

3: Brainstorm some of the reasons that one might disagree with the argument (see 1 above) and/or its support (see 2 above).
   For instance:
   “China is increasing its use of 'barefoot doctors' to reach rural communities.”
   “Rural populations, like America's Amish communities, frequently want to stay excluded and away from modern medicine, which they find religiously and culturally offensive.”
   “Even if Britain's rural citizens are moving to the cities, it's OK because they have better access to educational, artistic and social opportunities which they can eventually take back to their farms if they choose to return home, enriching the lives of everyone involved.”

4: Select the most important reasons you have brainstormed (see 3 above).

5: Compare your reasons and support (see 4 and 5 above) to your opponent’s argument (see 1 above) in order to show why your reasons and support are better than the argument of your opponent.
Put it all together into the *Four Step Refutation Method*.

**Step One: “They say. . .”**

State the argument you are going to refute along with the support for that argument (See 1 and 2 above). For instance:

*They say that the rural communities lack access to basic health care resources which is dramatically shortening the life expectancy and quality of life for such citizens.”.*

**Step Two: “But I disagree . . .”**

State the most important reasons you disagree with the argument of your opponent (See 3 above). For instance:

*But I disagree that rural communities are suffering dramatically because of a lack of access to resources.*

**Step Three: “Because. . .”**

Offer your own reasons to support your disagreement. For instance:

*Because the most important part of rural life is a cultural choice to be excluded from the rest of the population, as America's Amish demonstrate, and this includes practicing their traditional medical treatments of prayer and fasting.*

**Step Four: “Therefore. . .”**

Conclude by showing how your refutation weakens or defeats your opponents' argument. For instance:

*Therefore, prioritizing saying that rural citizens lack basic medical care is culturally offensive to the religious and ethnic practices of rural communities.*
2010 Youth Forum
Workshop on Note Taking
Skills Lab: Various Times

Duration: 90 min

Training objectives:

General objectives:

- To review the purposes of effective note taking and flowing a debate
- To provide and practice useful note taking and flowing skills

Practical objectives:

- Students will be able to identify and record the most important arguments in a speech.
- Students will be able to write concise and readable notes.
- Students will be able to prepare for note taking before a round and record critical information through simplified abbreviations during the round.
- Students will be able to use their note taking activity (flowing) to prepare for cross examination and response speeches.

Materials:
- (reusable) Index cards for “25 Words or Less”
- (1 per student) Handout containing
  - Model flow in “Discovering the World Through Debate” pages 162-163
  - List of common abbreviations

Session outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>1 game</td>
<td>Icebreaker: Modified “25 Words or Less”</td>
<td>Index cards with a word or a phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Trainer explains game, shows sample card, gives sample clues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Group is divided into two teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) One member from each team is selected. These two players</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pick one index card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- See the word/phrase on the index card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Make bids for how many clue words they will need to make their team guess the word/phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The lowest bidder wins the clue and gets to be the speaker in the round.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) The speaker has 30 seconds to get his/her team to guess the word/phrase using only the number of clue words he/she bid.

5) If the speaker is successful, team gets a point. If speaker uses more words than bid or team doesn’t get word/phrase on card before 30 seconds are up, the other team gets a point.

6) Repeat (there should be time for each person to get to bid for the chance to be speaker).

7) Debrief: In “25 Words or Less” the goal is to give very brief clues that convey word/phrase to your team. When note taking, it’s generally useful to be concise.

| 10 min | 2 | Group sharing on the practice of note taking:

1) Why do you take notes?
2) How do you take notes?
3) What do you like and dislike about your current methods?

In this activity, trainer should decide how to modify the rest of the lesson to reflect current practices and elicit/introduce purposes of note taking, including:

a) To keep track of arguments as they are made during a round (A debate is a clash of arguments, so to debate it is necessary to accurately hear and record what is said. Flowing is the method used in a debate to accomplish that purpose.)

b) To plan for upcoming cross examinations and speeches during a round (Keep track of points that need to be clarified during cross examination. Keep track of important arguments that must be addressed in future speeches. Communicate with teammates.)

c) Analyze the debate after the round, prepare for future debates (What arguments did the team address effectively? What arguments do you need to do more research and thinking on? Were there areas where you didn’t effectively carry the “team line”? Analyzing the flow after the round helps you prepare for future rounds. Always flow the entire round regardless of speaker position.)

| 20 min | 3 | Practice

One student makes an argument. Another student restates the argument. A third student writes it for all to see.

The group verifies/modifies notes so the notes capture original argument. Discuss difference between notes.
needed to re-state an argument and orally re-stating an argument. (Notes can be abbreviated, personal and informal but both forms must adequately capture the essence of the original argument.)

Repeat two or three times. Explain that capturing an individual arguments is a crucial building block for flowing a round.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 min</th>
<th>4 lecture</th>
<th>Lecture on the practice of note taking:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) What to write down as you listen to a speech (Most important to get down arguments, then evidence. Also track catch phrases or tag lines – using opponent’s language can help persuade judge that you are fairly representing their arguments. Use abbreviations (see handout) and develop nick names for common arguments (but listen for deviations from common arguments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) How to flow arguments “across” the debate. (Discuss handout. Ideally speakers will help you flow – listen for phrases like “in response to …” but you may need to do some of the work yourself. Keep track of arguments that are important with stars or a different color pen. Keep track of dropped arguments. Avoid repetition – in 2A speech, no need to re-write what’s already in 1A, focus on what has changed. Separate arguments from evidence, eg by marking evidence with an “E”. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) How to use notes to prepare speeches and CX. (Same principles as when you are listening apply. Think about what details you need on the page and what details you can fill in as you go. Organize yourself by numbering and create/using tags for important arguments. Mark points you want to bring up in CX with a question mark or leave a designated space on the flow for those points.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) How to use notes to communicate with teammates. Develop a common flowing notation. Flag arguments you want to discuss during prep time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Handout
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 min</th>
<th>5</th>
<th><strong>practice</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        |   | 1. Students assigned to groups of 3  
|        |   | 2. Students presented with a new motion  
|        |   | 3. Brainstorm (in groups) at least one affirmative argument and at least one negative argument  
|        |   | 4. Mini Debate #1  
|        |   | - Trainer explains mini-debate format. Everyone will flow.  
|        |   | - 1AC (no more than a minute)  
|        |   | - 1NC, 1 AR (no more than two minutes)  
|        |   | 5. De-brief  
|        |   | - Note taking during a round has three components: (a) Listening and reproducing on paper the arguments, (b) Organizing raw notes (stars or circles for important arguments, noting dropped arguments), (c) Notes to prepare for speeches that haven’t been made yet – techniques for organizing speeches before you give them and to communicate with teammates  
|        |   | 6. Mini Debate #2  
|        |   | - Same format as above  
|        |   | - Debrief  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 min</th>
<th>6</th>
<th><strong>lecture</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        |   | Preparing to listen – note taking outside the round  
|        |   | (Pre-flow: 1A always, 1N almost always. Develop nick names for common arguments and lists of responses. Practice flowing outside the round – learn how to flow the evening news and editorials in the newspaper.) |