

Lincoln-Douglas Debate: Theory and Practice

Compiled and edited by

Tom Pollard, University of Kansas
Diana B. Prentice, University of Nebraska

Edited and produced by

Independent Study
Division of Continuing Education
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

**Copyright 1981
University of Kansas**

**Graphics by
Charli Frederick**

Contents

INTRODUCTION	v
ABOUT THE AUTHORS	ix
UNIT I: A RATIONALE	1
The Importance of Values in Debates About Public Policy — Erwin Chemerinsky	3
A Step Toward Sanity — Dennis Winfield	7
Lincoln-Douglas Debate: A Re-Introduction of the Listener — Robert Kemp	11
UNIT II: THE THEORY	15
An Approach to Analyzing and Debating Lincoln-Douglas Debate Topics — Diana B. Prentice and Bill Davis	17
Constructing the Lincoln-Douglas Debate Resolution — Richard B. Sodikow	25
Johnson County Community College Applications of Lincoln-Douglas Debate — Richard Stine	29
Aspects of Coaching Lincoln-Douglas Debate — Dale McCall	33
UNIT III: THE PRACTICE	39
The Lincoln-Douglas Debate Experience — Mary C. Ambrose	41
Judging Lincoln-Douglas Debate — Rev. Raymond Hahn	47
Strategy of Lincoln-Douglas Debate — Alex L. Pritchard	53

APPENDIX	59
First Affirmative Constructive in Final Round: NFL Tournament, June 1980 – Mary C. Ambrose	61
Bibliography	63

Introduction

In August, 1858, the race for a vacant seat in the U.S. Senate in Illinois attracted national attention. A reporter for the *New York Tribune* stated at the time that “no local contest in this country ever excited so general or so profound an interest as that now waging in Illinois.”¹ The race was between Democrat Stephen A. Douglas and Republican Abraham Lincoln. The contest was dramatized by a series of debates between these politicians – one a defender of states’ rights and popular sovereignty, the other an opponent of slavery and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. A contemporary historian has maintained, “It is doubtful that any forensic duel . . . ever held the power of decision over the future of a great people as these debates did.”²

The original Lincoln-Douglas debates have been remembered both for their style and for their substance. Stylistically, these debates were not atypical of nineteenth-century political oratory. For instance, interaction between debaters and their audiences was common in that period. Both Douglas and Lincoln were frequently interrupted during their debates by comments, applause, and laughter from spectators, and both speakers occasionally addressed themselves to individuals in the audience. With such audience-speaker interaction, these debates must have been exciting events to attend, a point that has not been lost on those who formulated the modern Lincoln-Douglas format.

While the original Lincoln-Douglas debates excited audiences stylistically, they also did so by virtue of their content. The issues discussed were crucial to the audiences of 1858, and, significantly, they turned on questions of value. According to one observer, the conflict between pro- and anti-slavery forces revealed in the debates “touches some of the most vital principles of our political system.”³ The conflict between states’ rights and individual liberties was a crucial one on the eve of the Civil War, just as it has continued to be to this day. While specific governmental policies were debated – such as the Kansas-Nebraska Bill – the real conflict involved values, which is one reason why these debates have been remembered both as historical events and as models of good debating procedures.

The modern Lincoln-Douglas format, often abbreviated as L-D, was created in part to recapture some of the exciting aspects of the original Lincoln-Douglas debates and to provide an alternative to the contemporary team debate format. In fact, L-D debate has focused on a debating style that is far less stylized and “academic” than team debate. The major differences in the two formats are discussed below.

1. **Substance.** L-D focuses on questions of value, whereas team debate revolves around policy issues. For example, during the NFL National Tournament in 1980, L-D debaters

dealt with "Resolved: that the advantages of the present methods of funding the Social Security System outweigh the disadvantages." While it is true that policy options form a part of that resolution, the central issues are value-laden. In contrast, 1980 NFL National Tournament contestants who debated the team format resolution "Resolved: that the United States should significantly change its foreign trade policies" were primarily concerned with policy options, although values certainly played a role.

2. **Style.** L-D debaters are urged to adopt a delivery speed that is readily understandable to lay judges. In addition, massive use of evidence and abbreviated debate jargon is discouraged. By contrast, team debaters often speak at a rate of three-hundred words per minute or more and may cite forty pieces of evidence. Greater emphasis on traditional oratorical skills and persuasion is engendered by the L-D format than is currently the case with team debating.

Another difference between these two debate formats has perhaps been one of effect rather than of design. L-D debates are often less "formal" than team debates in the sense that they are less stylized. One would hope that this distinction will remain as the popularity of L-D grows.

While the popularity of L-D is growing rapidly, there remains a dearth of information for participants, coaches, and judges about what is expected of each. The idea that L-D debate should stress values, persuasion, and oratory is understood, but exactly how those goals are to be achieved is often less clear. This book is designed to begin filling the void between L-D theory and practice.

Theory and practice in debate are evolutionary. As a result, we fully expect a review and revision of many ideas presented by the authors. Those of us who read the early writings on comparative advantage strategy or the technical debate texts of the 1950s are amused by the simplicity, underdevelopment, and even naiveté of many of the ideas presented. In time, we may come to view many of the ideas presented in this book with a similar sense of amusement or condescension.

We believe, however, that it is essential to put ideas in writing in the early development stages of an educational activity so that they may be refined and more fully developed at a later date. L-D debate will grow and meet its objectives only if those objectives are stated and understood, and the means to meet them are articulated. This book is a beginning of that process and serves as a forum for ideas. If it stimulates thinking, evokes disagreement, or causes others to take pen to hand, we shall succeed in one of our major objectives: to contribute to the evolution of this format. If we are able to provide students and coaches with some technical tools to make the practice of L-D easier, we shall have succeeded in another objective: to help bridge L-D theory and practice.

Overall, we offer the reader an examination of an exciting new forensic event. We offer the views of authors who believe that L-D is a viable tournament event that makes a significant contribution to forensics education. L-D should not be viewed as a replacement for team debate

or as a superior form of argument because it deemphasizes elements that are subject to abuse in team debate. Rather, L-D is a complement to other forensics events and is capable of standing on its own as a worthwhile activity for high school debaters.

Notes

¹Robert W. Johannsen, *The Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 3.

²*Ibid.*, p. 4.

³*Ibid.*, p. 3.

About the Authors

Although the individuals asked to contribute to this book have long lists of accomplishments in forensics, they were selected because of their special interests in and experiences with Lincoln-Douglas debate. Thus, the biographical data below stresses their L-D experiences and accomplishments rather than their overall experience in forensics education.

Mary Ambrose is a student at Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska, and holds the distinction of being the first NFL National Champion in L-D debate. Since graduating from high school, Ms. Ambrose has worked with L-D debaters in the Omaha area and has lectured on preparation techniques for L-D debate.

Erwin Chemerinsky is assistant professor of law at DePaul University College of Law, Chicago, Illinois, and director of the Northwestern University National High School Institute in Speech. Mr. Chemerinsky has worked extensively with the analysis of values propositions through participation in N.H.S.I.'s Project Communication, a course designed to teach the role of values in public policy decision making.

Bill Davis is director of forensics at Washburn Rural High School, Topeka, Kansas. Mr. Davis's students began participating in L-D debate prior to the NFL adoption of the activity. After the NFL decision, Mr. Davis worked with Diana Prentice to develop analysis and coaching strategies and co-authored an article for the *Kansas Speech Journal* on L-D debate.

Rev. Raymond Hahn is director of forensics at Cathedral Preparatory School, Erie, Pennsylvania. Father Hahn was a member of the National Catholic Forensic League committee that developed the NCFL L-D ballot and has extensive L-D judging experience at the NFL National Tournament.

Robert Kemp is director of forensics at the University of Iowa and director of the National University Extension Association's Program on Discussion and Debate. Mr. Kemp's interest in L-D debate is in part an outgrowth of his work with the event since the 1976 Bicentennial Youth Debates.

Dale McCall is director of forensics at Twin Lakes High School, West Palm Beach, Florida. Ms. McCall was a member of the National Catholic Forensic League committee that designed the NCFL L-D ballot featured in this book and has also lectured extensively on L-D debate.

Alex Pritchard is director of forensics at Creighton Preparatory School in Omaha, Nebraska. Mr. Pritchard has been actively involved in developing coaching strategies for L-D

debate and has also coached one of the semi-finalists in the activity at the 1980 NFL National Tournament.

Tom Pollard is director of the Continuing Education Debate Program at the University of Kansas and has published widely in the high school debate area.

Diana Prentice is a doctoral student in communication education at the University of Nebraska and former director of forensics at Topeka High School, Topeka, Kansas. Ms. Prentice introduced L-D as a tournament event in Kansas two years prior to the NFL adoption of that event. In addition to working with L-D as a contest event, she has taught sections of Project Communication at the Northwestern University National High School Institute in Speech.

Richard Stine is director of forensics at Johnson County Community College, Kansas City, Kansas. Mr. Stine has been actively involved in values debate through his work with Phi Rho Phi, the community college speech association that has included L-D as a national event.

Richard Sodikow is director of forensics at The Bronx School of Science, Bronx, New York, and has been actively involved with coaching and judging L-D debate through the National Catholic Forensic League. Mr. Sodikow was also a member of the NCFL ballot committee and has served as director of Project Communication at the Northwestern University National High School Institute of Speech.

Dennis Winfield is executive secretary for the National Forensic League and was instrumental in making L-D debate a contest event of national stature. In addition to working with the development of L-D as a national event, Mr. Winfield has lectured on L-D at the Georgetown University Debate Institute.

Unit I: A Rationale

The three articles in this section provide three distinct reasons for the development of Lincoln-Douglas debate as a contest event. Mr. Chemerinsky's article gives a historical framework for the importance of values considerations in public policy decisions. This article introduces the premise for L-D debate — that the theoretical, and even moral, bases for policies are as important as the policies themselves. Mr. Winfield's article takes a more pragmatic approach to justifying Lincoln-Douglas debate by examining its importance as a unique activity offering an emphasis on issues and style that are less conducive to development in team debate. Mr. Kemp argues that the importance of the listener/critic in contest forensics can be emphasized through L-D debate. Mr. Kemp's article reminds us that listening skills are as much a part of the speech discipline as are oral communication skills.

The Importance of Values in Debates about Public Policy

Erwin Chemerinsky

SCENE 1: The floor of the New Jersey Senate. The issue being considered is whether the legislature should enact a law requiring all motorists in New Jersey to wear seat belts. The debate over the measure is heated. Proponents of the bill argue that thousands of lives would be saved if motorists wore safety belts, something that won't happen unless usage is made mandatory. Opponents argue that such a requirement would infringe the freedom of drivers and passengers to decide for themselves whether to fasten their seat belts.

SCENE 2: A college classroom. A political science class on American foreign policy is being held. The issue being discussed is whether the United States should sell grain to the Soviet Union only on the condition that Russia allow Jews to leave the country. Some students are taking the position that protecting Soviet Jews from religious oppression must guide our foreign policy and that trade should be used as a lever to protect human rights. Other students argue that the United States has no right to influence another country's internal politics. Just as American citizens thought it wrong for oil exporting nations to use oil as a weapon to blackmail the United States, so would it be wrong to use food as a political weapon.

SCENE 3: The United States Supreme Court. The case being argued is *National Socialist Party v. Skokie*. The issue is whether the Village of Skokie's decision to prevent the Nazi party from marching in Skokie violates the First Amendment of the Constitution. The attorney for the National Socialist Party argues that no town may exclude a speaker simply because it finds the message offensive. Freedom of speech requires protection of expression for ideas we hate, not just those with which we agree. Skokie's attorney argues that the privacy of the town's residents, many of whom were once in concentration camps, justifies restricting the Nazi's protest.

What do these three scenes have in common? On the surface, they are markedly different. They occur in radically dissimilar settings — a noisy legislative chamber, an old classroom, the solemn and magnificent Supreme Court. The issues involved — traffic safety, foreign policy, and constitutional law — share little in common. Yet, despite these differences, there are fundamental similarities. All these scenes involve disputes over public policy questions. In each, there is a controversy about what should be done by government.

Moreover, in each instance, the dispute ultimately turns on a question of values. A value is simply a statement of what is deemed to be important. For example, in the first scene, the

proponents of mandatory seat belt laws base their argument on the value of human life. Because human life is important, they advocate a law that would prevent needless deaths.

Every individual holds many values, and some values are widely accepted in society. Privacy, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and popular elections of government are examples of values that are ingrained in American culture. Values provide the goals that public policies are designed to maximize. If human life is a value, laws should be directed to saving life. If freedom of speech is paramount, society must structure its rules to insure the right of expression. Simply stated, the first step in all debates about public policy is to identify the values that provide the goals for policy choices. All policy questions are based on value premises. To decide what should be done first requires a decision as to the ultimate goals to be achieved.

If it were a perfect world, it would be possible to identify the value to be maximized and then determine which policy option best meets that value. Unfortunately, rarely is the choice so simple. Usually, there isn't one value involved but many values, all deemed important. In fact, achieving one value often means sacrificing another. For example, human life and freedom of choice are both values cherished by most Americans. Requiring mandatory seat belts would save lives but would deny freedom of choice. It is impossible to resolve the dispute over whether a mandatory seat belt law should be enacted without first resolving the conflict between these two values. Likewise, in the second scene, before you can decide the direction of foreign policy, it is first necessary to ascertain what value should guide decision making. Both national sovereignty and human rights are worth protecting. But one must be preferred over the other in deciding whether the United States could tie exports of grain to Soviet policies on Jewish emigration.

Nor are any values so absolutely true as to be favored in *all* circumstances over all others. Not even life itself is an absolute value. Society is willing to sacrifice tens of thousands of lives in wartime. There are undoubtedly circumstances in which even the pacifists among us admit that they would kill. As such, it is not possible to simply choose the policy that saves the greatest number of lives. Instead, citizens and leaders must decide what is worth sacrificing lives for and how much should be spent to save lives.

Similarly, though we all probably agree that freedom of speech is a good thing, the question is when must we sacrifice it to achieve other objectives. Should obscenity and pornography be banned, or are these forms of expression more important than society's moral justifications for suppression? Should defamation and libel be proscribed in an attempt to protect reputations, or is this, too, speech that should be protected?

What is needed is to develop techniques for resolving these difficult questions of value. How should leaders go about choosing which value has priority in the law that they enact? How should judges weigh conflicting values when ruling on cases involving crucial issues of liberty and constitutional rights? How should we, as citizens, establish a hierarchy of values to aid us in forming our opinions?

By definition, a value cannot be proven to be true. One value cannot be empirically demonstrated to be more important than another. Values are qualitative judgments about what is important and hence are inherently subjective. People inevitably differ in their opinions about what value should be paramount. For example, in the third scene, some believe that protecting the privacy of Skokie residents justifies excluding Nazi protestors. Others maintain that freedom of expression is so important that it must be given priority over privacy considerations. There is no way to statistically prove one of these arguments right and the other wrong.

The inherent subjectivity of values often leads policymakers to try to ignore them in reaching decisions. People will focus on what means to use when it is really the ends that are in dispute. A clear and tragic example of this myopic vision is America's involvement in the Viet Nam War. How did men who prided themselves on their humanitarian outlook come to authorize aerial bombardment of villages and massive displacement of innocent civilians? How could men, the best and brightest of their generation, grossly underestimate the strength of the enemy and consistently ignore the devastating repercussions of their decisions within the United States?

A large part of the answer is that decision makers never questioned the ends at stake, focusing, instead, entirely on the means. In 1965, the Viet Cong attacked South Viet Nam. A group of top-level advisors met to decide what America's response should be. The values to be upheld were never discussed. Should the goal be to contain Communism? To stop Communist China? To prevent wars of liberation? Was Viet Nam of strategic importance? None of these questions was examined. Instead, the group concentrated exclusively on what would be the most effective military response. A plan for massive bombing of North Viet Nam, labelled "Operation Rolling Thunder," was endorsed. The escalation of the Viet Nam War began and continued without any consideration of the goals to be achieved.

If nothing else, the lesson of Viet Nam should be the need to focus on values in making policy choices. Yet, time and again, decision makers focus on what can be measured and ignore values that can't be discussed in empirical terms. For example, a price tag cannot be put on human life. But the cost of safety measures in a factory can be estimated. All too often, occupational safety is ignored, because its benefits cannot be put in terms of dollars and cents. Ignoring the value conflict — industrial productivity versus saving human life — leads to poorly considered choices, favoring what can be measured over what can't. Similarly, the aesthetic beauty of a wilderness or a sparkling river can never be estimated in monetary terms. Yet, few would argue that such considerations should be omitted from decision-making processes.

History repeatedly demonstrates that policymakers court disaster when they ignore value questions. During World War II, the United States interred 110,000 Americans of Japanese descent in concentration camps on the West Coast. Aliens and citizens, adult and children, were moved on short notice from their homes to detention centers. They were arrested without warrants and held without trials. In part, this occurred because public officials ignored the conflict between protecting national security and safeguarding individual liberties. The fear of a Japanese invasion of California during the early stages of World War II was so overwhelming that

policymakers focused entirely on how to best handle the problem of security. In reaching their decision, they ignored the effect of their policy on the freedom of Japanese Americans.

Simply put, these examples illustrate that value conflicts must be resolved in deciding public policy questions. Ill-advised, even tragic, decisions result when people focus on "means" and ignore the "ends." To decide what is right or just or moral requires one to focus on values. All policy decisions are premised on value choices.

Yet, the inherent subjectivity of values inevitably means that legislators, litigants, and debaters tend to avoid questions of value. Value questions are most important, but often least discussed. Is there an answer to this paradox? I am convinced that it must be found in the development of techniques and skills for arguing questions of value. Argumentation must provide the tools our society can use in critically analyzing value choices. Only when people are proficient at arguing values will policy debates focus, as they should, on underlying value premises.

To this end, Lincoln-Douglas debates provide training in techniques of arguing values. Participants develop an appreciation of the importance of values in debates about public policy. Furthermore, they develop techniques for resolving conflicts and become adept at articulating and expressing their resolution. The problems of the late twentieth century will involve difficult value choices by government and citizens alike. Lincoln-Douglas debate is one important way to prepare students for this challenge.

A Step Toward Sanity

Dennis Winfield

Somewhere I read the following:

A billion seconds ago, Pearl Harbor was attacked. A billion minutes ago, Christ walked the earth. A billion hours ago, man did not exist. A billion dollars ago was yesterday afternoon in the federal government.

After listening to the 1979 final round of two-man debate at the National Forensic League National Tournament in Cincinnati, Ohio, I felt that I had listened to a billion words being spewed forth in little over an hour.

Five months after that national tournament in 1979, the NFL Executive Council was scheduled to meet. In those intervening months I received many calls and letters that, to say the least, were very critical of that final debate and debate in general. One school superintendent indicated that, if this were what debate had deteriorated into, he wanted no one in his school district to be exposed to such an "educational" adventure. A school principal suggested to the National Association of Secondary School Principals that they withdraw their sanctioning of our tournament, because debate could no longer be called an educational activity.

Steven Rosen, a reporter for the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, wrote the following for his paper after listening to that final round.

One thing about speech — you can get too busy talking to listen.

The two teams in the final debate match of the National Forensic League's championship tournament, which concluded Friday at Princeton High School, might have done better to listen to the finalists in other categories.

For instance, in oratory competition, high school students protested such subjects as gobbledygook in language, the decline of quality and the "me-first" syndrome.

In debate, they practiced what the others preached against. Four young men demonstrated speed reading under the guise of a championship-caliber debate concerning the energy crisis.

It was enough to make at least one National Forensic League official speak in despair. "Debate now (has) volumes of material; presentation has gone out the window," said H. B. Mitchell, in whose name the debate trophy is given.

"They don't communicate now," he said. "They talk so fast you can't understand them. I think they've lost the art of communication."

Indeed, much of the audience which numbered close to 1500 during the evening awards ceremony, wandered away from the school's auditorium during the debate match.

Each of the two teams had been arguing with other teams about energy in state and regional matches for much of the past year. Armed with briefcases full of information, but constrained by time limits, the debators spouted off as many facts as fast as they could — much faster than most could understand.¹

The problem posed by debaters — at least some call them that — who speak at a rate beyond comprehension; who "spread" their opponents out of the room; who say, "I have 10 other cards that say the same thing but I won't take the time to read them — I'll leave them here for you to read after the round"; or who admonish us to "go to sub-point 8 under sub-contention E under contention II," was to leave some of us with red faces. We tried gallantly, but in vain, to assure the critics that this too would pass and that some semblance of sanity would return to this fine educational discipline.

Conversations with members of the NFL Executive Council confirmed that the members knew of the problem but didn't know what could be done to bring about a remedy. Mr. James Copeland, a member of the Executive Council, was the first person to suggest that perhaps we needed another event, similar to two-person debate, that would require a proposition of value, demanding persuasion, analysis, and comparison from the debater. The members of the Executive Council agreed. Mr. Frank Sferra and Mr. Copeland suggested the title of "Lincoln-Douglas Debate," which was unanimously accepted by all nine of the NFL Council members meeting November 9, 1979.

Some have criticized and "made fun of" the Council's swift action in adding Lincoln-Douglas as a district and national event. Some say it was dictated by private companies who have helped underwrite our national tournament. This is not true. The NFL Executive Council was deeply concerned that, for the last four years, our organization had lost schools with debate programs, even at a time when we were growing in school memberships. The growth was in individual events, not debate. We knew that superintendents and principals who had once given support to debate in their schools were withdrawing that support. We also knew there was a hard core of several hundred individuals throughout the country in high schools, colleges and universities who had taught and undoubtedly would continue to teach students that the way to win, the way to get that decision, is to learn and practice those mindless "shot gun" tactics of "motor mouthing," which the Council felt would ultimately bring about the death of debate in America.

The Council's action in adding Lincoln-Douglas debate was swift. With the exception of Colorado, very few states had any knowledge of the event. We were treading in unplowed soil. Mistakes were made. We readily admit that. We try to correct, to refine, and to improve as we move forward. I know that, when other events were first attempted, they went through a similar process of trial and error. Even today, events that have been in existence for years undergo change. The process we are involved in with Lincoln-Douglas debate is not new. I personally feel

that the leadership of NFL should be congratulated, not condemned, for bringing this new event forward. Perhaps I missed it, but I didn't see any other speech organizations or state speech organizations advocating Lincoln-Douglas debate before the NFL took action!

Since the addition of Lincoln-Douglas debate in the spring of 1980, it has become the second largest NFL event. It is now offered in all but a few states.

Donna Ross in *A Coaches' Guide to Lincoln-Douglas Debate* states:

Unlike the custom in Oregon debate, students in L-D try to be slow, persuasive and (when possible) entertaining. They develop a consistent perspective (philosophy) on the proposition using two or three main arguments and supporting these with logical reasoning, clear analysis, and some evidence. The negative will present a counter-philosophy and support that in a similar manner. Both sides will refute opposition by exposing flaws in the opponent's reasoning, analysis of the question, and evidence.

Instead of looking for solutions to problems, we are looking for the truth about the issues. This makes ethical considerations and persuasion more important than ever. The L-D debater has a serious responsibility to focus on the issues, to see relationships, to discard trivia, to have a broad working knowledge of history, and to avoid all distortions and obfuscations. The debater must weigh not results, but ideals.²

Ms. Ross has, in my opinion, defined what coaches and students should strive to achieve in Lincoln-Douglas debate. When they met in November of 1979, the NFL Executive Council believed that these were the elements lacking in the present two-person debate. The problem has to be remedied.

Lincoln-Douglas debate was introduced by the National Forensic League with the belief that it would help solve some of the existing problems and criticism. Since its introduction, I feel many of the problems enumerated in this paper are less evident today than they were two years ago. Anyone who has listened to the last two national final rounds of two-person debate knows of the tremendous improvement in style, content, and delivery practiced by all of the debaters in those rounds. No, we have not returned to my era, "the recipe file box debate days"; but in two short years, coaches and judges are demanding that debaters communicate and use some semblance of logic in a debate. Those coaches and judges have finally realized there is power in the ballot.

The NFL Executive Council, of which I am a member, wants both Lincoln-Douglas and two-man debate to grow in stature and in numbers of participants. I think the recent changes that have taken place will allow the Council's goal to reach actualization.

Notes

¹Steve Rosen, *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, 23 June 1979, p. D-2.

²Donna Ross, *A Coaches' Guide to Lincoln-Douglas Debate* (Speech and Theater Association of Missouri, 1980), pp. 3-4.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate: A Re-Introduction of the Listener

Robert Kemp

The current interest in Lincoln-Douglas debate by interscholastic debaters is, I believe, a confirmation that the audience should again become part of the activity. Large crowds listened, cheered, applauded, and even heckled the Presidential hopefuls of another era. The audiences were catered to because they were the ones who would eventually cast their ballots.

Somehow, the idea of catering to audiences (critics who also cast ballots) has been lost by interscholastic debaters. This seems a bit strange since so many of the teachers of these students have been educated in communication theory. Theorists note these qualities in the speaker-audience relationship: "the audience expects to hear, understand, and enjoy a speaker who has something worthwhile to say."¹ And Alan Monroe adds to this perspective when he said, "As we study speech, therefore, we must be careful not to think of it as an isolated thing; we must think of speech in its functional setting, as a means of communication, as something going on *between a speaker and listener*."²

Monroe's observation seems to have been forgotten in so many interscholastic debates. So often, nothing seems to be happening. The critic-judge becomes a recorder of information. Because that information comes so rapidly, the recorder-critic has little opportunity to look up, even to establish any eye contact with the speaker. The critic-recorder, much like a secretary in a court room, must be continually transcribing the messages. Thus, little mental stimulation occurs. Afterwards, time permitting, the critic-recorder may examine the transcript, weigh the words, and render a ballot. If Lincoln-Douglas debate is ever to resemble its nineteenth-century namesake, then debaters should be encouraged to make something happen between themselves and a critic-judge. (If something does occur the recorder aspect can be diminished.)

Certainly, the Lincoln-Douglas debater is seldom lacking for evidence or interesting material. Some of the topics suggested by the National Forensic League have included the following:

Resolved: that military conscription is a superior alternative to a voluntary army.

Resolved: that the protection of human rights should have a higher priority in shaping America's foreign policy.

Resolved: that national security is more important than government honesty.

Resolved: that inflation is to be preferred over unemployment.

These topics can involve arguments of morality, economics, national security, and human values. None of these areas is really inherently dull stuff. In fact, the issues are close to being downright interesting. Since these topics have been cover stories in major news magazines, front-page stories in daily newspapers, and the subject of best-selling books, the evidence is not all that difficult to come by.

Yet, many debaters find what appears to be indifferent audiences. The solutions to indifferent audiences is offered, rather appropriately, in *Thinking and Speaking: A Guide to Intelligent Oral Communication*.

Often we have made an effort to listen and understand what the speaker was saying and found that intrinsically it was sometimes quite interesting and even vital. Yet the speaker's manner was such that instead of commanding attention he discouraged it. Such speakers are the opposites of the legendary "patent medicine man." Instead of making something worthless sound valuable, they make something valuable sound worthless.³

Thus even with volatile subjects and available supports the debates may not be easy or interesting to listen to. The need can be met it seems. "From the point of view of the listener, delivery is good when it commands his attention and enables him to grasp the speaker's meaning."⁴

Thus, I am calling for Lincoln-Douglas debaters to re-introduce an awareness of the listener in their rounds. Surely a debater should be expected to seek supports, develop analytical skills, and build sound arguments. In addition, a debater should make sure that the material is intelligible and stimulating to the critic-listener. As so succinctly stated in *The Speaker and His Audience*, "the most important element in the speech situation is the listener."⁵

The listener can be a passive or an active one. A passive judge may faithfully record and number the arguments. He or she may carefully fill out a ballot. But a passive listener is like most listeners: physically comfortable, emotionally at a low point, and intellectually unstimulated. The results are described:

Learning is proportional to the involvement of the learner. Learning is an active process. The amount of learning is in proportion to the participation by the learner; mental and physical activity increases the effectiveness of the learning process. To quote from *The Speaker and His Audience* again, "We learn and recall only that to which we respond."⁶

In this perspective, Lincoln-Douglas debaters can be educators. They attempt to teach the importance of a value, whether it be one of human rights or military security. The debaters should seek to make the judge a listener. Surprisingly, that task is not so difficult. After years of abuse in the form of 300 words per minute delivery rates, unimaginative arguments, a critical judge is ready to become a thoughtful — and thankful — listener.

In conclusion, each Lincoln-Douglas debater should attempt to make the judge a listener, not just a recorder. This process can be made possible if the debater will present materials in a way that will engage the mind of that critic. In other words, the delivery can help create an atmosphere where the coach will again want to serve as a judge. The resulting interaction will assure a good speaker-audience relationship. The job of the coach is to encourage students to be listener oriented. In the final analysis, the entire forensic community will benefit.

Notes

¹R. Wayne Pace, Brent D. Peterson, and M. Dallas Burnett, *Techniques for Effective Communication* (Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1979), p. 236.

²Alan H. Monroe, *Principles and Types of Speech* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1953), p. 28.

³Otis M. Walter and Robert J. Scott, *Thinking and Speaking* (New York: MacMillan, 1968), p. 124.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 125.

⁵Martin P. Anderson, Wesley Lewis, and James Murray, *The Speaker and His Audience* (Evanston: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 53.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 67.

Unit II: The Theory

Although theory and practice are difficult to separate, these articles emphasize the underlying theory of L-D debate more than the practical aspects of the event. Ms. Prentice and Mr. Davis examine values theory and explore methods of applying that theory to analysis of L-D topics. Additionally, they suggest how the theories underlying values debate should influence practices. Mr. Sodikow's article grapples with a perennial debate problem — how to structure topics to produce the best debate and achieve the activity's goals. Mr. Stine considers the issue of format and relates the goals of values debate to its structure. Several alternatives to time limits and speaker responsibilities are examined. The final article by Ms. McCall considers the many perspectives from which L-D debate is viewed. Using lessons learned from the original Lincoln-Douglas debates, Ms. McCall considers the nature of clash and speakers' strategies.

An Approach to Analyzing and Debating Lincoln-Douglas Debate Topics

Diana B. Prentice and Bill Davis

Soon after the National Forensic League added Lincoln-Douglas debate to its tournaments, debaters, coaches, and judges were confused about the nature of the beast. While many argumentation and debate texts provide information about values propositions, little has been written about Lincoln-Douglas debate as a contest event. The NFL supplied the following guidelines for participants:

An orthodox variation of standard debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate, is also known as "One-Man Debate" and has been utilized often during political campaigns.

Only two speakers are involved, one fulfilling the affirmative case responsibilities and the other, the negative. Since students participating in Lincoln-Douglas type debating are usually speaking to an audience, they should be encouraged to develop a direct and communicative delivery. *Emphasis* is necessarily placed upon the issues involved rather than upon strategy in developing the case. The statement of the topic is a resolution of value rather than of policy. This results in emphasizing logic, theory, and philosophy while eliminating "plan" arguments.¹

For debaters who are accustomed to entire textbooks being devoted to procedures for researching, analyzing, and debating policy topics, this explanation and cursory treatment of values debate in argumentation texts leave much unsaid about the "how to" of Lincoln-Douglas debate. While an overemphasis on process could lead to the stylized form of debate common in policy debate, an absence of guidelines promotes adaptation of policy jargon and analysis techniques to Lincoln-Douglas. If Lincoln-Douglas is to succeed in increasing communication skills and logical analysis, the distinct qualities of values propositions must be separated from those of policy propositions. While we do not claim to have received "divine revelation" into the nature of Lincoln-Douglas debate, we have developed some theories based on our experiences and reading. The suggestions contained in this article are by no means the only way to analyze and debate values topics, but they constitute an approach that has proved workable for us.

This article appeared in the *Kansas Speech Journal*, Vol. XLII, No. 3, Spring 1981. It is reprinted here with the permission of the Kansas Speech Communication Association.

Exploring the Nature of Values Propositions

The concept of a value is more difficult to grasp than that of a policy. As a result, debaters must begin their analysis of Lincoln-Douglas topics with an examination of values and values propositions. Based on an examination of literature on values and values propositions, we have reached five conclusions about the nature of values debate.

1. **Propositions of value evaluate the external world.** Value propositions rely on subjective judgments as the basis for debate. Values explain perceptions of the world but cannot be verified as can facts. Colburn wrote that "there are no 'absolute measures' to aid the debater in determining values premises."² Values debate relies on relative determinations of what is good/bad, desirable/undesirable, just/unjust, right/wrong, better/worse, etc. Lincoln-Douglas topics are written as evaluative statements (Resolved: that it is morally unjustifiable to require an individual to join a labor organization as a condition of employment), and debaters are asked to focus on the evaluations stated and implied by the topic.

2. **Values can be classified.** The concept of values can be more comprehensible to debaters if a systematic method is used for explaining and examining values. Lincoln-Douglas requires debaters to locate values conflicts inherent in a topic. Unless debaters know what they are looking for, the values conflicts may not emerge. Three classification systems make this stage of analysis easier.

A common classification system is the one presented by Fryar and Thomas in *Basic Debate*. They classify values as artistic or aesthetic, moral and ethical, and political. The first category includes beauty, symmetry, good taste, and their opposites. The second set, moral and ethical, includes right and wrong, just and unjust, good and bad. The final type, political, has considerable importance for the debater. This category includes democracy, cost efficiency, rights, and law and order.³

A second system comes from Rokeach who classifies values as terminal or instrumental. Terminal values refer to those associated with goals or desired states of existence. Instrumental values provide the means for attainment or describe desired modes of behavior. Terminal values include equality, freedom, and a world at peace. Instrumental values are ambition, honesty, and obedience.⁴

A third classification system is more general and can be used in conjunction with the other two. This system involves determining core values and their related premises. Using this method of classification, debaters can build values hierarchies and can explain specific value conflicts as they relate to broader levels of values, for example, instrumental values versus terminal. Sillars explains the role of value hierarchies in argumentation:

What then is the real difference? It is not in different values, usually, but in a different *hierarchy of values* that real argumentation takes place. While not denying the possibility

of a direct confrontation of values, a modern system of analysis should assist the arguer to select the potential value hierarchies in each issue which will seem the most reasonable to the audience.⁵

The application of hierarchies can be illustrated with the topic, "Have the courts protected defendant rights at the expense of society?" The core value could be argued as the sanctity of individual human rights. According to the topic, two subordinate values conflict — the right to a fair trial and the right to live in a safe society. Under these two values are additional, more specific rights such as the right to counsel. The focus of the debate should center on determining which set of subordinate values better guarantees the core.

By classifying values and establishing hierarchies, value conflicts can be classified. Debaters will discover that a classification system provides a focus and compels clash and analysis.

3. Values are commonly shared by a majority of society. Since it is possible to label or categorize values, it is also possible to search for commonalities among individuals' value systems. One level at which comparisons are easily made is at a national or cultural level. Because citizens of a country tend to accept the laws, customs, and cultural heritage of that country, it is not uncommon for members to share many of the same values — at least at a core level. Steele and Redding isolated the core values of Americans and established the following list: Puritan and pioneer morality, the value of the individual, achievement and success, change and progress, ethical equality, equality of opportunity, effort and optimism, efficiency, practicality and pragmatism, rejection of authority, science and secular rationality, sociality, material comfort, quantification, external conformity, humor, generosity and "considerateness," and patriotism.⁶

Steele and Redding's list suggests two considerations for the debater: (1) which of the values, either core or related, serves as the underlying value in the debate topic, and (2) which values cannot be attained simultaneously and provide a basis for clash. While the list of core values can serve as a framework for identifying values, it is important to note that values are not static. Values vary across time and cultural subgroups. Steele noted, "Many premises are broadly shared throughout a society, but there are other premises which are characteristic of only one group or subculture. Value premises are not the same in California as in the deep south. . . . Value premises are not the same today as during the depression years."⁷ Core values are perceived hierarchically, and debaters should consider shifts in the hierarchy when analyzing topics.

The notion of shifts in society's predominant values is applicable to the labor organization topic. The founders of labor unions were concerned with protecting workers from unsafe conditions and with guaranteeing adequate wages. Since the inception of unions, union activity has grown beyond the original intent and government now plays a large role in protecting laborers. As a result of changing conditions in unions and laws, an affirmative could argue that forced membership is no longer justifiable as a way of protecting all workers from abuses.

Since values are shared and exist over time, debaters should examine both current and past positions of values on a hierarchy. Many Lincoln-Douglas topics require teams to make value judgments about policies that originated when predominant values differed from those currently held by the majority of Americans. The evolution of values within the context of a policy also provides a focus for Lincoln-Douglas debate.

4. Values cannot be separated from propositions of fact and policy. Although Lincoln-Douglas debate does not require a plan, it does force debaters to evaluate policies. Evidence is emphasized less than in policy debate, but facts can be used to establish values positions. For instance, debaters supporting the topic, "The advantages of genetic engineering outweigh the disadvantages," would want to document medical or agricultural breakthroughs from genetic research. Moral issues would also come into play, but even those issues could be supported through facts. A discussion of prosperity for abuse could be supported with examples from Hitler's Germany.

Whether debaters realize it or not, values propositions are used in policy debate. The debater who argues that dollars saved by a plan should be weighed against lives lost is arguing from a value orientation. If debaters consider the value judgments made in policy debate, their understanding of Lincoln-Douglas debate should increase.

The Lincoln-Douglas debater takes facts from which values determinations are made and shows their relationship to the values under discussion. The analysis stops short of proposing new policies to replace those being evaluated. The debater suggests a direction policies should take without offering a formal plan.

5. Values are linked to motivation. The ultimate goal of the Lincoln-Douglas debater is to persuade the judge or audience that one value position is preferable to another. Persuasion theory tells us that change will not occur without dissonance. Thus, the debater can create dissonance by showing that one of five conditions exists: (1) a core value is jeopardized by either a subordinate value or the core value of a minority; (2) advocacy of a specific set of subordinate values will better ensure achievement of a core value; (3) the present value system is inadequate, because it either violates a core value or prevents its attainment; (4) a new set of values has overwhelmed the old and is superior; and (5) the core value is not identified easily due to a fragmentation in society.

As debaters research values propositions, the pervasive societal values can be determined and then applied to analysis using one of the five frameworks to motivate a judge to reach a particular decision. Debaters should receive instruction in persuasion to gain an understanding of the role of motivation. Persuasion theory is important in policy debate, but debaters seldom have the time to engage in a systematic study. Lincoln-Douglas requires less research and deals with a narrower topic area, making it more conducive to in-depth study of persuasion and motivation theories.

Debating Lincoln-Douglas Topics

Once debaters have gained an understanding of values and have identified and analyzed values inherent in the resolution, affirmative and negative arguments and cases can be prepared. The following suggestions are intended to provide practical guidelines for the Lincoln-Douglas debater in preparing cases and debating them.

1. Structuring the Lincoln-Douglas Affirmative. While the Lincoln-Douglas affirmative is more oratorical than a first affirmative constructive in a policy debate, debaters should identify and label major values and issues conflicts. The superstructure of typical debate speeches is unnecessary, but the use of forecasting and signposting can enhance communicativeness. One organizational framework that permits an affirmative to identify values conflicts and provides a factual basis for the values includes (1) definition of explanation of key words or phrases in the resolution, (2) identification of the core value, (3) historical background on the nature and importance of the topic, (4) isolation of the major issues, (5) establishment of a defense for the chosen values hierarchy, (6) conclusion.

2. Preparing the Negative Position. The negative should follow the same analytical processes suggested for the affirmative in both the pre-writing and case development stages. The negative should not prepare an inflexible manuscript, however. The negative should also avoid an extensively evidenced point-by-point spread when analyzing the affirmative case. Clash and persuasion are key elements in Lincoln-Douglas debate, and the negative should develop a framework for analysis based on an identified value system that clashes with the affirmative's. Evidence should be used to support the position; it should not be the position.

One of the beauties of Lincoln-Douglas debate is the absence of "squirrels." Since there are so few core values applicable to any one topic, a negative should be prepared to debate them all. The negative can accept the affirmative's core value and proceed to present a subordinate values hierarchy that better achieves it, or can disagree with the core. The negative constructive should weave defense of a values system with refutation of the affirmative's position. One of the five frameworks discussed earlier should allow the negative to develop a position and provide a comparison.

3. Rebuttal Strategies. Most Lincoln-Douglas formats allow the affirmative two rebuttals and the negative one. Because of the structure, a negative should anticipate the affirmative's final line of argumentation and, through the use of two-sided arguments, preempt affirmative extensions. The negative has sufficient time to review the negative position and the key areas of clash as well as to compare hierarchies if the hierarchy is used as the framework for the constructive speech. At the conclusion of the negative rebuttal, there should be no doubt in the judge's mind as to how the two debaters differ and why.

The affirmative must resist the temptation to cover the entire debate in the limited time period provided for each rebuttal. The actual areas of clash are usually few in number. If the

traditional policy practice of noting specific affirmative analysis that has not been answered is omitted for all but major values conflicts, sufficient time should be available to summarize and clarify the values in conflict and why the affirmative analysis offers the best method of attaining the values. Unlike policy debate, it is less important to quibble over whether a question of fact or specific example has been refuted. So long as the *major* values conflicts are agreed on, extensions of their analysis is more important than detailed accountings of each argument. Persuasion is the key in either affirmative or negative rebuttals. The judge must be given reasons to compare and accept one system of values as superior or personally more acceptable than the other.

4. Cross-Examination Strategies. Since Lincoln-Douglas deals with value or subjective issues, as opposed to factually based policy proposals, cross-examination periods should not be used to display a lack of factual data. Rather, cross-examination should center on *why* the affirmative or negative supports a particular position. *Why* focuses the questioning on the values involved. Cross-examination should be used to identify the values under discussion and clarify why a conflict exists. No Lincoln-Douglas debate can be won in cross-examination alone, but the period can be used to strengthen the basis for comparison of value systems. Debaters should keep in mind that the cross-examination period is a source of appeal or non-appeal to the judge. Sarcasm and brow-beating are as inappropriate in Lincoln-Douglas as they are in policy debate.

5. Delivery. In discussing delivery, the best guideline is the title of the event itself. Though most schools do not provide stumps for the participants, the same concept of speaking to an audience unconvinced of what is desirable, moral, or ethical still applies. The judge votes and will be convinced only when motivated by persuasive techniques. A judge is usually not persuaded by volume, speed, or quantity of arguments. Instead, the judge is persuaded by and votes for the speaker who provides what is perceived as the more ethical and personally acceptable set of values. Clarity is a key to Lincoln-Douglas delivery, and clarity is best achieved through a limited amount of jargon, clear organization and clash, and conviction. To put it bluntly, he who confuses, loses.

Summary

While every debater argues vehemently that his or her era was the "golden age" of debate, the present era has been criticized more vociferously than most as undeserving of the title. The inauguration of Lincoln-Douglas debate as an NFL-sponsored event may not change the course of policy debate, but it can offer an alternative. Lincoln-Douglas debate will be successful in its stated objectives only if participants and judges clearly understand its nature, its intent, and the reasons for its development. Much of what debaters know about policy debate is inapplicable to Lincoln-Douglas debate. Since the event is still open to interpretation and experimentation, debaters and coaches should make a concerted effort to develop theory and practice unique from policy debate and to share the successes and failures of experiments with others. The key to Lincoln-Douglas debate is, however, its simplicity, and development of the activity should not overlook this factor.

Notes

¹Dennis Winfield, "From the Executive Secretary," *The Rostrum*, December, 1979, pp. 2-3.

²C. William Colburn, *Strategies for Educational Debate* (Boston: Holbrook Press, 1972), p. 20.

³Maridell Fryar and David A. Thomas, *Basic Debate* (Skokie: National Textbook Co., 1979), pp. 12-15.

⁴For a complete discussion of values, see Milton Rokeach, *The Nature of Values* (New York: The Free Press, 1973).

⁵Malcolm O. Sillars, "Audience, Social Values, and the Analysis of Argument," *The Speech Teacher*, 22 (November 1973), p. 302.

⁶Edward D. Steele and W. Charles Redding, "The American Value System: Premises for Persuasion," *Western Speech Journal*, 26 (Spring 1962), pp. 85-90.

⁷Edward D. Steele, "Social Values, the Enthymeme, and Speech Criticism," *Western Speech Journal*, 26 (Spring 1962), p. 72.

Constructing the Lincoln-Douglas Debate Resolution

Richard B. Sodikow

The major attraction of Lincoln-Douglas debate for most coaches and contestants has been that it is supposed to be a *new* forensic competition, not half of an *old* one. But the activity *is* debate, and there's the problem. "Debate" carries with it so much connotative supercargo that the term has become a generally ineffective communicator. Certainly the layman's view of debate has become colored by the belief that it is marked by trickery and equivocation at worst and by shallow, simplistic, two-valued reasoning at best. Even professionals in forensics and communications have begun to consider debate a pejorative term, the more so as two-person, interscholastic competition becomes more and more sophisticated. (Some might even be inclined to describe it as sophist, not sophisticated.)

In order to approach the construction of the resolutions to be debated in Lincoln-Douglas debate, then, we must have some agreement about what the activity is. For the purposes of this presentation, "debate" will be a structured argument between two incompatible positions articulated on the acceptability of some specific statement, or "resolution," with an individual or group serving a judging function to determine which position is most probably correct. For any debate, several conditions will be agreed to in advance: the number and nature of the representatives of each position, the format of the presentation(s), the nature and specific wording of the resolution, and the number and nature of the judge(s). Additionally, while much of the literature uses "resolution" and "proposition" interchangeably, for our present purposes, "resolution" will refer to the specific wording debated, and "proposition" will be the more general subject for the debate.

The Lincoln-Douglas format, as we accept it, stipulates a single speaker on each side; a format that includes a constructive speech, rebuttal speeches (one for the negative speaker and two for the affirmative), and cross-examination; a single judge (or a small odd-numbered panel of judges); and a resolution supporting a proposition of value. With the last stipulation, we arrive at the major issue in Lincoln-Douglas debate.

Just what *is* a proposition of value? Most authorities would seem to agree that it is an assertion of the "goodness" or usefulness of an idea or concept. Unfortunately, most of these same authorities assume that interscholastic debates will generally be concerned with propositions of policy. In *Strategic Debate*, in fact, Roy V. Wood states that propositions of value are suitable for debate on television programs so as to stimulate interest in a viewing audience. He claims that it is difficult to resolve such propositions and that "[they] often make the best topics for 'bull sessions' because the participants can argue for hours and never arrive at a solution."¹ This is

clearly indicative of the kind of bias that will have to be overcome if Lincoln-Douglas debate is to be made, the propositions of value will have to be susceptible to argument that can be resolved. The wording of the resolution, then, must be able to meet three major tests.

First of all, the resolution must support a proposition of value rather than a proposition of policy. Thus, the wording must not require implementation of some proposal, nor should it require the *continuation* of a policy currently in operation. The option of debating a plan or policy example(s) should not be removed from the affirmative speaker, but nothing about the resolution should *require* him to do so. Secondly, the resolution should be debatable. Not only must there be clear issues that can be addressed by both the affirmative and the negative speakers but there must also be freedom from inherent prejudice; that is, skills aside, any resolution must offer both debaters equal potential to win. Finally, the resolution ought to provide an interesting area of debate for the contestants and the judge(s). How nice it would be, then, if our Lincoln-Douglas debaters were given the opportunity to explore important values that inherently lie at the heart of all policy decisions without having to defend various specific policies that *might* be implemented as manifestations of the value. It is to be hoped that this would lead to careful analysis of the motives for human behavior and require less emphasis on intricate numerical data, the proliferation of which has become endemic in competitive debate. With these considerations in mind, it might be interesting to examine some specific statements offered in the past few years as Lincoln-Douglas resolutions.

In 1979, the National Catholic Forensic League offered Lincoln-Douglas debate for the second time and proposed as the resolution to be debated: "Resolved: that the United States should encourage the exploration and development of outer space." This came in the early stages of experimenting with the format as more than a local or regional event, and there was no stipulation about using propositions of value. Clearly the resolution in question was a proposition of policy, which led to some unfortunate confusion among debaters, coaches, and judges. Some thought that plans were required, and some thought plans were prohibited. Here was an interesting subject for debate with clear issues for each side to pursue, but the resolution required the affirmative speaker to present a plan or at least to defend an implicit plan.

When the National Forensic League first decided to include Lincoln-Douglas debate as a national event in 1979-1980, many of the resolutions required weighing the advantages against the disadvantages of various policies. While this was an *attempt* to decide the worth of the practice, the resolutions required the debaters to argue policy outcomes. Thus, at the NFL National Tournament in June, 1980, the Lincoln-Douglas debaters were required to deal with "Resolved: that the advantages of the present methods of funding the Social Security system outweigh the disadvantages." Since advantages and disadvantages develop as a direct outcome of policies (even if those policies are implemented because of values), debaters were required to defend and attack various methods (plans) of funding social security. Not only did this force one-on-one policy debate but also required debaters to research such intricate details and present so much of the evidence garnered as to preclude any analysis of values. Again we had an interesting subject for debate, but clear values issues did not exist. In fact, both sides seemed to have to accept the

implicit value that *government* must take responsibility for the welfare of society's elderly and/or disabled. This *assumes* the value of governmental responsibility for services, something that might have made an interesting debate with the potential for in-depth analysis.

More recently, the resolutions offered by NFL for Lincoln-Douglas debate have been much more carefully worded. One of the suggested resolutions recently presented is "Resolved: that the American press has abused its freedom." Certainly, since this statement deals with "freedom," we have a clear question of value. When we apply the second test, however, we find a probable skew in favor of the affirmative. It is likely that debaters will be able to come up with any number of abuses committed by the American press; thus, the resolution becomes an example of a proposition of *fact*. Perhaps the addition of the adverb "unjustifiably" before "abused" might make the resolution more fairly debatable. That might provide the potential for a more interesting debate on the *value* of a "free press" to a democratic society rather than an analysis-stifling debate on the definition of "abuse." In "Resolved: that the provision of financial security for the needy is a moral duty for America," we again have an attempt to limit the debate to values by the reference to "moral duty." Since "America" is not necessarily "the American government," however, it would seem that the negative speaker here would have to argue against the provision of financial assistance to the needy by *any* segment, public or private, of American society. Once again, that would seem to put the affirmative speaker at a decided competitive advantage. On the other hand, if we were to add some wording to indicate that the moral responsibility is government's, we would run the risk of having the debaters assume they are to debate "Resolved: that the government should provide financial security for the needy in America." Nevertheless, without some agent specified in the resolution, the negative speaker is denied a persuasive, competitive position and probably has no reasonable chance of winning the debate.

These brief comments are hardly intended to provide deep or comprehensive analysis of the resolutions in question. They do, however, suggest a caveat: we should be more careful in constructing resolutions; they should be examined and dissected by a group of people in some dialectic process before they are offered for debate.

There are fertile areas to explore for potential values resolutions. One such area is the body of proverbs and adages we have all grown up with. "Honesty is always the best policy" and "the best government is the least government" are two examples. Again, however, we must be careful to select statements that are fair to both sides and provide both with reasonable positions to support. A second area to examine is the values components of policy statements. For example, last year's national high school debate resolution dealing with consumer protection might suggest concern with the values underlying the policy. Are corporate goals inconsistent with consumer safety? Is consumer protection, taking sides between the consumer and the producer, a reasonable governmental role? The answers to these questions can provide potentially successful Lincoln-Douglas debate resolutions. No matter what source we use for the resolution, three questions can help us to be sure there are clear values to be debated. 1) Can we identify the *motives* that make people behave as they do? 2) Can we identify a *conflict* in these motives? 3) What allows one motive to take precedence over the other(s)? If we can write the proposed

resolution after answering those questions, then we are likely to find it an example of a value proposition. The dialectic process recommended will insure that the resolution is debatable and fair, and the same process will determine the interest raised by the resolution.

Additional discussions are provided by at least two other sources. McBurney and Mills provide a brief analysis of a process for choosing statements to be debated,² Ronald J. Matlon more extensively addresses values propositions and their relation to propositions of fact and of policy.³ Certainly this paper cannot make a simple process of a complex one, but it can organize the process into a sequence of tasks that can be handled more easily, completion of which should provide us with debatable examples of value propositions.

In conclusion, it is of the utmost importance that the writing of the Lincoln-Douglas resolution must be no more a one-person activity than is the construction of the team debate resolution. Unless we offer prospective resolutions to some deliberative body and process for careful examination, we run the risk of presenting non-debatable statements or statements that force debates off the track intended when the activity was adopted. The activity needs room to develop naturally and establish its practices and theory. We should not frustrate that natural development, nor the youngsters and coaches who participate, because of our lack of care in selecting the resolutions to be debated.

Notes

¹Roy V. Wood, *Strategic Debate* (Skokie: National Textbook Company, 1972), pp. 11-12. See also William Dean Brooks, *Introduction to Debate* (New York: Exposition Press, 1966), p. 28.

²James H. McBurney and Glen Mills, *Argumentation and Debate: Techniques of a Free Society*, 2nd ed. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964), pp. 192-93.

³Ronald J. Matlon, "Debating Propositions of Value," *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, XIV, pp. 194-96.

Johnson County Community College Applications of Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Richard Stine

Interscholastic academic debate has been a very valuable part of our curriculum for most of the twentieth century. While its basic *raison d'être* has remained largely unchanged, its forms reflect the dynamic thinking of the leaders in the field and the realities of argumentation. One such change is the rapid growth of Lincoln-Douglas debate, culminating in its recent inclusion as an event in the National Forensic League's regional and national tournaments.

This style of debate obviously does not owe its genesis to twentieth-century competitive tournaments but can be traced far beyond even its namesake debaters to the Athenian senate and courts. For some reason, academic Lincoln-Douglas debate has been largely ignored in our times until very recently, disallowing the scrutiny and analysis given team debate. What this paper will attempt to do is discuss the special and unique qualities of Lincoln-Douglas that necessarily affect the formats devised for its practice. We will also consider the circumstances affecting our choice of selecting for use either policy or non-policy propositions. Specific formats will then be offered to meet those unique qualities.

Lincoln-Douglas debate is not simply a team debate cut in half. Consider the plight of the negative speaker if he had eight minutes to argue case (need/justification) *and* plan attacks in the time it normally takes to do just one. Or, equally frightening, what about having only one affirmative rebuttal to answer both case and plan attacks with no time for the usual summary arguments?

In a Lincoln-Douglas debate, there is a policy proposition, and the format offers two constructive speeches of the same length (normally eight minutes each). The affirmative has no handicap, because the first affirmative constructive speech is the same as if it were given for a team debate. The negative, conversely, has a tremendous problem. There would seem to be no way to do justice to case attacks and plan attacks in one speech; they would be so diluted and/or rushed that to attempt to do so would be probable suicide. Should the debater then stress either case or plan attacks and hope the judge agrees with the choice? What happens, then, to a balanced attack so prized and expected by most judges? A number of coaches might consider it a valuable learning experience for their students to decide between those two basic thrusts of case and plan attacks, but I suspect most coaches would prefer an alternative that would allow for a balanced attack and adequate time for argument development.

Let us now consider the problems of a one-rebuttal affirmative. The affirmative in academic debate is considered to have the more difficult position, because of the mandate to present a prima facie case and the nature of presumption. Therefore, they are allowed the first and final speeches. Lest the negative feel slighted by our treatment of the affirmative team, they rely heavily on that mid-point in the format when they have back-to-back speeches known as the negative block. This block of time, most effectively used by the second constructive speaker for plan attacks and first rebuttalist for a return to case attacks, is often the most crucial time in a debate round. If it is structured well, the first affirmative rebuttalist will find it very difficult to budget time adequately to answer all of the most crucial arguments in the time allotted. It is left up to the last speaker to focus the debate for the judge in the best interests of the affirmative.

At a time when Phi Rho Pi (a community college speech organization) first experimented with Lincoln-Douglas at the national tournament, the format was as I described above: 8-3-8-3-4-4. Midwest debaters had no experience in one-person debate; therefore, in an attempt to make up lost ground to other parts of the country, notably the West Coast where Lincoln-Douglas had already caught on well, our squad decided that, at the national tournament, we must overcome the negative constructive's problem of trying to give some depth to both case and plan attacks. Our negative constructive devoted six minutes to normal case attacks and spent two minutes launching unsupported, underdeveloped plan attacks with the promise of support and development to follow in rebuttal. The result was that the negative had twelve minutes of unanswered argumentation, leaving the affirmative with only one four-minute rebuttal speech to do what should require two speeches to accomplish. The final result of our effort was no losses on negative at the national community college debate tournament. It was too bad, we thought, that our affirmative was not as good, because we lost on that side in the semi-finals.

Although we happily accepted our reward for skillful maneuvering, we recognized that all we had done was exploit a weakness in the system. By spending only two minutes at the end of the constructive speech on plan attack outline, we legitimately offered no new arguments in rebuttal, but the result was the same for hapless affirmatives. At a business meeting of Phi Rho Pi at that same tournament, we offered a new format for policy proposition debate using the Lincoln-Douglas approach, which we argued would avoid further damage to this rapidly developing style of academic debate. That format will be offered to you later in this chapter.

The National Forensic League Lincoln-Douglas format currently suffers from a problem similar to the ones already cited. Their format is as follows:

- 6 Aff. Constructive
- 3 Neg. Cx
- 7 Neg. Constructive
- 3 Aff. Cx
- 3 1st Aff. Rebuttal
- 6 Neg. Rebuttal
- 4 2nd Aff. Rebuttal

In this time frame, there is an attempt to solve the plight of the affirmative by eliminating the negative block and allowing the affirmative two rebuttals to one long one by the negative. What it does not solve is a weakness in the negative constructive of too little time for case and plan attacks. The affirmative constructive is shortened by two minutes, which throws a very heavy burden on that speaker to offer justification for change and an adequate plan in just six minutes. Not long ago, coaches and debaters alike cried aloud to the heavens that comparative advantage structure, by placing the plan in first constructive, took away much of the time needed to develop the harm area in team debate. To further cut the time seems to assume that, since the number of debaters is halved, so must the number of issues be halved. I seriously disagree with this assumption. The number of issues may diminish, but not by half. I further believe that a Lincoln-Douglas debate round need not be only half as long as team debate, not even the thirty-two minutes given by NFL.

Perhaps the most serious problem in devising a format for Lincoln-Douglas debate centers around the distinctions between policy propositions and the less complex propositions of value and fact. Policy proposition debates require the implementation of a plan that essentially doubles the potential issues typical in debates using propositions of the other two types. Perhaps because of this breadth of issues and the time necessary to argue them, many coaches feel that Lincoln-Douglas debate ought not to use policy propositions, believing that a debate with half the usual number of participants is capable of adequately maneuvering only half as many issues. I would agree with this objection in rounds of thirty minutes or so. Debates of fact and value can be handled in short debates, but policy debates and arguing plans cannot.

This discussion raises an important question. Should Lincoln-Douglas debate use propositions of policy at all, or should they be limited to fact and value propositions? My position may be apparent by now. I believe that fact and value propositions can use a shorter version of team debate, even thirty minutes; however, when arguing propositions of policy, I would recommend the following format:

- 8 Aff. Constructive
- 3 Neg. Cx
- 12 Neg. Constructive
- 3 Aff. Cx
- 6 1st Aff. Rebuttal
- 6 Neg. Rebuttal
- 4 2nd Aff. Rebuttal

This format has several features. First, the first affirmative speech is still eight minutes long, for I argued that the obligations of a single advocate are no less than a team of affirmative advocates in that speech. Second, the total time is forty-two minutes, allowing the time not given in shorter formats for development of arguments. Third, the negative block is intact in the form of a twelve-minute speech, which eliminates the shallow, skimming approach and the need to make a choice between great case attacks and unbeatable plan objections (and the possibility that the

judge would have you choose the road not taken). Fourth, the affirmative maintains two rebuttals, which allows the necessary differences in function and obligation of that side.

Another consideration is that of preparation time. Whether one approves of it in team debate, a case can be made for its use in Lincoln-Douglas debate. Five minutes (half that given most often to teams when it is granted) to be used whenever deemed necessary by each debater would allow the negative to prepare a twelve-minute speech complete with case and plan attacks. The affirmative, likewise, will certainly need time to prepare responses to a twelve-minute barrage.

One final, very important item should be addressed here when discussing the distinction between the propositions from which we must choose. Not only should the format reflect the proposition type but also the phrasing of the proposition. The National Forensic League this past year used the following as a value topic: "Resolved: that the protection of human rights should have a higher priority in shaping American foreign policy." The words "should" and "policy" are very misleading; "should" is the key word in every proposition of policy, and "policy" adds irony to the wording of a value proposition. The result at the national tournament was that some cases took on plans and some did not; those that did were criticized by the negative for doing so with a proposition of value, and those that did not were in trouble by some judges who expected one.

The problem is not by any means limited to any one organization. Every proposition used should be carefully screened for any such potential confusion. Adopting separate formats for policy and value-fact propositions will help signal the debaters what is desired and expected from them. And the coaches would likely welcome some clarification of an event that has tremendous potential value to American academic debate and, indeed, is already making giant strides toward respectability and validity in that arena.

Aspects of Coaching Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Dale McCall

Let us recall the poem by John Saxe.

It was six men of Indistan,
to learning much inclined.
Who went to see the elephant
(Though all of them were blind.)
That each by observation
Might satisfy his mind.

One put his hand on the side of the elephant and said that it was like a wall. The second felt of a tusk and was sure the elephant was like a spear — pointed, sharp. The third got hold of the trunk and decided the elephant was like a snake. The fourth put his arms around the knees of the elephant said it was like a tree. The fifth touched the ear of the elephant and said it was like a fan. While the sixth, from behind seized the tail, and reported that the elephant was like a big rope.

And so these six men of Indistan
Disputed loud and long.
Each in his own opinion
Exceeding stiff and strong,
Though each was partly in the right,
And all were in the wrong.

Each of us, as we try to define and coach Lincoln-Douglas debate, sees the discipline from a different perspective as did the blind men examining the elephant. There are those who look at the persuasive aspects and say, "It's oratory." There are some who exclaim, "No, it's like extemp." More frequently, too many assume that Lincoln-Douglas debate is nothing more than one-man traditional debate. As the blind men of Indistan, we fail to grasp the totality of the discipline, for Lincoln-Douglas debate is a sum of all its parts. Just as the elephant was described as anything but an elephant, we, too, tend to attribute qualities of the known to the unknown.

I will submit to you that Lincoln-Douglas debate is a new, unique entity. At the same time, however, we have a historical precedent for establishing some guidelines in coaching this rather new event in an old discipline.

Examining the Original Lincoln-Douglas Debates

When Lincoln and Douglas originally presented their seven historic debates in Illinois, there were two vital issues at stake. Lincoln's position was that slavery should not be extended any farther into the territories. Douglas countered with the concept of popular sovereignty of the territories and the states. Although Douglas was the eventual winner of the senatorial election, these debates catapulted Lincoln into a prominent position from which he would win the Presidency and attempt to establish once and for all that men are created equal. If we were to phrase these debates into value propositions for today's Lincoln-Douglas debaters, they might read as follows: "Resolved: that slavery is morally evil," or "Resolved: that popular sovereignty is more important than the issue of slavery." I would strongly urge you to read at least one of these original debates as you prepare yourself to coach and your students to learn.

Lessons to be Learned from the Original Lincoln-Douglas Debates

In reading these original Lincoln-Douglas debates, we find several crucial factors that distinguish them from other forms of competitive speaking. First, although Lincoln and Douglas did argue policies that might be an outgrowth of their value positions, the major confrontations were those of values. Specifically, Lincoln argued that slavery was morally wrong. Douglas, on the other hand, stressed states' rights as being of greater importance than individual freedom for blacks. Second, there were no delineated plans of actions (no board mandates, no schemes for financing, etc.). Third, little evidence was used (no 10,000 pieces of evidence or "my card is more recent than yours"). Fourth, the use of logic and persuasive appeal was the order of the day. Fifth, there was an absence of debate jargon and explicit *prima facie* burden arguments.

Phrasing of Lincoln-Douglas Propositions

The wording of the Lincoln-Douglas proposition to be debated is of paramount importance. All of us who coach Lincoln-Douglas should do our utmost to ensure that tournament officials properly construct value resolutions. Students are placed in a most awkward and confusing position when they are faced with "Resolved: that the federal government should re-institute mandatory conscription." This resolution, phrased as a policy option, ensnares students and judges alike into the trap of debating Lincoln-Douglas as if it were team debate. A better phrasing, for value purposes, might be: "Resolved: that mandatory conscription is *superior* to an all-volunteer armed forces." There are several factors to keep in mind when phrasing the topic of value. 1) The topic chosen should not give the advantage to either side; it should be a debatable issue. 2) A value term should exist in the wording of the resolution. 3) The value wording should carry with it the connotation of something desirable from a moral, political, or utilitarian viewpoint (or some combination of the three).

Affirmative Case Construction

The next essential step in helping our students delineate the uniqueness of Lincoln-Douglas debate is in the case construction. If we return to our original Lincoln-Douglas debates, we perhaps can gain a clearer view of affirmative case construction. In these debates, there was no clearly delineated structure such as we see in a traditional debate with all the major points, sub-points, and sub-sub points. Neither did these debates exhibit anything comparable to the typical structure of an extemporaneous speech, although many of the logical processes are the same. The nature of the original Lincoln-Douglas debates is more correlative with a blend of legislative debate, extemporaneous speaking, and oratory. First, the Lincoln-Douglas affirmative case, because of the value emphasis, should have a persuasive style comparable to that of an oration. Second, the Lincoln-Douglas affirmative should have the logical progression of an extemporaneous speech. Third, the use of documentation in the Lincoln-Douglas affirmative should be stated as an integral part of the speech. May I suggest the following outline for the Lincoln-Douglas affirmative:

1. an interest-arousing introduction with a transition into the statement of the resolution;
2. the body of the speech consisting of several factors — criteria for judgment, what needs will be fulfilled by accepting this resolution, and/or what harms might occur if we don't accept the resolution;
3. documentation in the body of the speech *when necessary*;
4. an impact conclusion.

I would certainly recommend listening to the approach used by the affirmative speaker in the final round of the National Forensic League National Tournament.

Preparation of the Affirmative and Negative Positions

After carefully researching the background and current history of the topic area to be debated, one of your first considerations as the affirmative should be: by what criteria shall I decide the superiority of the value judgment I am called on to defend? In other words, what are the crucial issues? Second, the negative speaker should determine, based on the values to be defended, what criteria for judgment should be used. Third, both the affirmative and negative should determine what the audience "need" factors are in dealing with this topic and how these "need" factors can be utilized in their approaches. Fourth, the research should produce "evidence," authoritative opinion on the subject, documentation by use of example, and fact.

Negative Speaker Approaches

Depending on the specific value proposition to be debated, the negative has several different options available. Let us return for a moment to our original Lincoln-Douglas debates. Lincoln's

position against Douglas in the popular sovereignty debate on slavery could have had several different responses. One, he could have taken the position that slavery is morally evil and should not be extended any further than it now is. (Indeed, this was his position.) Two, he could have chosen to defend the position that, since slavery is a moral evil, we could go one step further and abolish it altogether. Third, he could have taken the position that the rights of the people as represented by the federal government supersede the rights of individual territories or states. From these original debates, we can see that the negative of today has the same type of options. First, the negative can totally deny the affirmative position or, second, can claim there are more important values that conflict with the affirmative values. Third, the negative can claim that both positions are important and that we should not have to make the choice. If we were dealing with our draft resolution, "Revolved: that mandatory conscription is superior to an all-volunteer armed forces," the negative could claim an outright denial of the affirmative value, using counter values. The negative could also take the stance that while the affirmative proposition might be true, using the affirmative's criteria, the negative criteria are more important. Finally, the negative might take the position that military superiority is worthwhile, using survival and security goals, but that this superiority can be achieved short of having mandatory conscription.

As with the affirmative, the negative should establish what the criteria are for making the negative position the better one in the debate. Debaters must postulate the various affirmative approaches and arguments that might occur and be prepared to defend against them. Debaters should avail the same trap that Douglas fell into at Freeport when Lincoln posed the following question: "If by popular sovereignty, the people choose not to have slavery, would you accept that position?" Remember, Douglas was seen by the South as the "champion" of slavery. Lincoln had Douglas trapped; there was no other answer than, "Yes." The damage done by Douglas's answer to Lincoln's one question made a great deal of difference in who became President in 1860.

The Nature of the Clash in Lincoln-Douglas Debate

In traditional debate, presumption is said to rest with the negative. In Lincoln-Douglas value debating, there seems, however, to be no inherent presumption, except as each side persuades the judge as to which values are more important. Thus, negative presumption arguments would not be standard argumentation in Lincoln-Douglas debate. In traditional debate, the affirmative assumes *prima facie* burdens but not in Lincoln-Douglas. In value debating, the affirmative is not mandated to prove such burdens as inherency and solvency.

In traditional debate a negative team must clash with the stock issues or fail to meet its burden. In value debating, direct clash with a *specific* argument is not necessary to win the debate. The direct clash should be with the value supported by the proposition. Clash is based on analysis rather than on "ten responses to his one argument supported by massive numbers of evidence." Quality is more important than quantity in value debating.

Policies are often natural outgrowths of value argumentation, and, as such, the negative might find more familiar grounds for argumentation in this area. It would seem that it is clearly legitimate for the negative to argue that, if we accept a given value, there will be consequences ensuing. Although a traditional debater might call these disadvantages, we should recognize the major differences in the methods for handling these arguments. In value debating, it is essential that the consequences offered by the negative be "reasonable" in nature. These consequences should appeal to the basic audience needs and should be offered as an integral part of the speech. The consequences should be presented in a persuasive, logical, coherent manner. If we were debating the superiority of mandatory conscription over the all-volunteer armed forces, we, as the negative, could claim that democratic principles would be undermined as a consequence. We could argue that the principle that democracy is weakened by a volunteer army is more important than those values advocated by the affirmative.

Judging the Lincoln-Douglas Debate

After a year of experimentation with Lincoln-Douglas debate as a competitive event, it seems that a majority of students and coaches are realizing the uniqueness of this category. As coaches, it is our responsibility to ensure that the judges also realize the special qualities of this event. Too often we have heard comments from the students or have read comments on the ballots to indicate that a number of people tend to judge Lincoln-Douglas debate as if it were team debate. So long as Lincoln-Douglas remains a fledgling event, it is our duty to see that judges understand the necessity of treating this event as a unique entity. It is strongly advocated that, during these first few years of development of Lincoln-Douglas debate, very concrete judging instructions be given either orally or in writing. Having talked with judges who have used several different types of ballots during the various tournaments in which they have judged Lincoln-Douglas, I am left with the impression that the more specific the ballot, the more accurate the judging. I would strongly recommend for your use the National Catholic Forensic League ballot, which appears in this book. What we seem to be looking for in Lincoln-Douglas debate is clearly spelled out for us in the criteria for judging that appears at the top of the ballot.

Conclusion

Many examine Lincoln-Douglas debate and say it's like team debate; others exclaim that it is much more like extemporaneous speaking. There are some who say it is like oratory, and then there are those who equate Lincoln-Douglas debate with legislative debate. It is time for all of us to proclaim that Lincoln-Douglas debate *is* Lincoln-Douglas debate in the manner and tradition of those original debates — at once logical, persuasive, oratorical, and dealing with vital issues and values that are not easily settled. It is time to re-examine our elephant and see him for what he really is.

References

Winston, Jon. *Ripples from These Troubled Waters*. Omaha: Harrison Publishing Co., 1945.

Angle, Paul M. *Created Equal? The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Dennis, Frank L. *The Lincoln-Douglas Debates*. New York: Mason & Lipscomb Publishers, 1974.

Unit III: The Practice

This section expands on some of the practical suggestions for theory implementation given in the last unit. The article by Mary Ambrose is written from the perspective of one who has participated in the event. Ms. Ambrose shares practical suggestions for research, notetaking, and case preparation. The article by Father Raymond Hahn examines an important area of L-D debate — judging. Father Hahn describes the characteristics of a ballot developed by the National Catholic Forensic League, which focuses the criteria for judgment on the unique qualities of values debates. If L-D is to succeed, education of judges is as crucial as is the education of coaches and debaters. This article provides a logical approach to this process. In the final article, Alex Pritchard discusses strategies that will produce clash in a Lincoln-Douglas round. General suggestions for development of arguments, as well as specific strategies for constructive and rebuttal speeches, are given.

The Lincoln-Douglas Debate Experience

Mary C. Ambrose

I was really excited to hear from the University of Kansas that they had recognized the need for a practical guide to Lincoln-Douglas debate and wanted to gather information and opinions on this topic. As a competitor in 1980 and as a judge ever since, I have been sparked with enthusiasm for this new forensic event, yet confused over the particular procedures concerned with it. Since Lincoln-Douglas Debate (L-D) has only been an event for two years in national competition, its purposes, procedures, and characteristics must be discussed to assist the novice L-D debater. If L-D debate is to grow as an event and continue to develop, it must be understood, practiced, and enjoyed.

In order to professionally perform in an L-D round, one must get to know what L-D debate really represents. The more L-D debaters know about how it evolved, the more they'll understand what it is. The concept of L-D debate is as old as the political races. Popularity for this type of "shouting match" blossomed some 120 years ago during the Senate race in Illinois between Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas. Surprisingly, Stephen Douglas won. More recent adaptations, such as time limits on speeches, however, have transformed this old-style political confrontation into an exciting new debate format.

The reasons for the creation of L-D debate differ from coach to coach. Some forensics critics indicate that L-D debate was created as an alternative to two-man, fast-speaking, evidence-dumping, game-show-playing regular debate. Others proclaim that L-D is an event that synthesizes many skills, such as persuasive speaking and issue analysis, and talents. No matter which philosophical viewpoint one adopts, an L-D participant must be conscious of these contrasting viewpoints. It is important to realize that different judges place different values on L-D debate. Before the final round at Nationals in L-D, both my competitor and I were warned by coaches, fellow competitors, and even the executive secretary of the NFL, Dennis Winfield, that it was crucial to speak slowly because most people at Nationals recognized L-D as the alternative to regular debating; therefore, there should be no fast delivery rates.

There are, however, many other characteristics of L-D debate besides a slow delivery rate and a verbal one-man clash. To be precise, L-D can be described as a combination of extemporaneous speaking, oratorical skills, and debate techniques. After observing a round of this type of debate, one will find that the evidence used is the type delivered in an extemporaneous speech, including a select bibliography. The eloquence and intellectual information of L-D make it sound like an oratory, not a fast-paced debate, and the strategies of each speech and the

evidence used resemble the finer skills of regular debate. The debater who coordinates these three characteristics in the 35-minute round will usually come out on top.

Two important characteristics of the Lincoln-Douglas clashes in the 1800s have remained in the 1980 debates. The first characteristic is the substance of what was argued. Because nineteenth-century political debates were also campaign speeches, debaters tended to compare and contrast their values and philosophies. Modern L-D debate has this characteristic, for it uses value debating rather than policy option. In other words, the L-D debater is concerned, not with policy comparison, but with a question of values.

The second trait visible from the 1800s is the actual arguing style of the debaters. Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas did not carry around five briefcases, three files of evidence, and forty volumes, nor did they read their arguments rapidly from a 4 x 6 card. They utilized three skills — extemporaneous speaking, oratory, and debate technique — to help them win their political battles. Therefore, in L-D debate, one should strive for a smooth, unified presentation. By uniting the characteristics of L-D debate into a performance and by thoroughly exploring the purposes of L-D and its development in your region, one can easily delve into the actual preparation that goes into a round of competition.

There is a considerable amount of work that goes into a performance of Lincoln-Douglas debate. Throughout all the mechanics of preparation and performance, there are two focuses to use in every step: adaptation and synthesis. Because L-D is a new event, changes are developing in and out of the round. Debaters can keep adapting to these changes and synthesizing what they know already about L-D and what they comprehend about extemporaneous speaking, oratory, debate technique, and the newest input. In that way, L-D debaters can stay ahead.

As a second event L-D debater who had never done this event before Nationals, all I seemed to do was play "catchup," simultaneously trying to learn the skills and perform the skills. After every round, I rewrote both my negative and affirmative cases in order to perfect them. I had arranged both cases into blocks of arguments, which allowed me to take them apart, switching or moving evidence from round to round. It is hoped, however, that the reader planning to participate in L-D debate will have had many more practice rounds than I had and will know more than just having read two *Rostrums*, the official NFL magazine. It is true, though, that from round to round and tournament to tournament, adjustments will have to be made.

There are three key activities that, if well coordinated, create and execute a polished L-D debate. A debater must write and construct his or her personal case or presentation, both affirmative and negative. The affirmative affirms the stated resolution; the negative negates the stated resolution. L-D debaters must prepare responses to their opponent's arguments and, finally, must properly deliver their product. L-D debaters must argue either for or against the said resolution and must defend their positions by challenging their opponents.

Research

Before debaters can challenge or defend anything, they must have case material. First, they must read material exploring the resolution. For example, if debaters must write a case on the resolution "Capitalism is superior to Communism," they should read the theoretical literature, such as Marx's *Communist Manifesto* and Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. They must absorb the information written about both sides of the question so that they will be able to argue the advantages and disadvantages of both systems. Next, they should move on to the periodicals, for by examining current opinions on the subject, debaters gain more modern information about the topic. The two skills of adapting and synthesizing can be used here for combining the two types of material. As debaters read, they should copy down important arguments and quotes. If there is one book or document that explains the entire topic, it should be taken to the tournament. In 1979, when the merits of Social Security were being discussed at Nationals, *Social Security Today and Tomorrow* by Robert Ball was a personal imperative. Take along only one or two briefcases containing gathered and organized books and information.

If you are debating a concrete system such as Social Security or the volunteer army, discover the internal mechanics of the organization, such as the insurance funds that operate it or the enlistment quotas. The more informed you are, the easier it will be to defeat the opponent's arguments. For instance, if the opponent argues that one of the three insurance funds is bankrupt, a prepared debater can explain that there are surpluses in the other two funds. Or, if the opponent claims that "Communism is superior economically," the debater who has done his or her research can state that capitalism is superior socially and politically. Extensive research has then paid off, but research is not always as simple as it sounds. For example, if you are asked to compare honesty to friendship, statistics or opinions on that topic are not going to be easy to find. The best preparation for such a topic is to study philosophical ideas rather than statistics. A vital point to remember about effective L-D research is to synthesize information while bearing in mind that you are doing a values comparison — not a policy debate. In L-D debate, you do not attempt to make the best statistical comparison; rather, you should weigh two values and persuade others that one value is superior to the other. L-D debaters should not only argue for their value; they should also defeat the opposing value.

Writing the Case

As previously mentioned, I found that the best way to put together a case is in blocs of ideas and information. Write the blocs of information on cards or half sheets of paper so that they can be easily shuffled. These blocks are easily understood, compared, taken apart, reformed, or removed. Do not try to compose an introduction or conclusion until the case is completed. The research obtained should be simplified into very simple sentence structures. You do not want or need a complicated outline, only significant points. I found it helpful to develop three or four reasons why, for instance, communism is superior to capitalism and also three or four major reasons to support the opposite position. You must have statements of value and statistics that

reaffirm the strength of these arguments. It is vital to be able to use these tools both in favor of the L-D case, and also against it. It is valuable to prepare the negative ideas expressing concepts; for example, communism is not superior but also inferior in value to capitalism. Simple sentence structure is a vital key in the arguments because of the controversy over what the judges should write down or "flow" from each speech. It is important to realize that you cannot attack someone else's case without also establishing your own case. The best way to organize all this is a bit complicated. You need to justify your reasoning with some evidence and then logically explain the position while tying the entire case together.

After building your defense or attack of a topic, you need to add other components. A witty, well-written introduction is a necessity. It has to capture and keep the judge's and audience's attention, not bore them. It should introduce the resolution, the position on the resolution, perhaps even yourself, and allude to why you take this position on the resolution. As an introduction to my position in a final round that affirmed the strengths of financing Social Security, my introduction started with a description of the value of financial self-sufficiency in which our forefathers believed, explained that in 1935 they established a system that has four mechanisms that maintain that value of financial self-sufficiency, and affirmed the resolution. Of course, if one has a well-written introduction and a substantial, well-defended case, one also needs a conclusion. The conclusion of any L-D case, whether affirmative or negative, needs to reestablish the boundaries of the resolution, the parameters of the arguments, and the paramount justification for the claim that one has reached a viable conclusion. Conclusions not only summarize but also end speeches and so must be prepared thoughtfully and clearly.

An additional point of importance is that all these previous instructions on how to write a case are applicable to the affirmative or negative positions. An L-D speech needs to have three components: an introduction, lines of reasoning from the position, and a strong conclusion. If you have these components, look over the case and find ways to polish it. Is it simply organized? Do you have literate quotes with which to tie the ideas together? (Bartlett's *Book of Familiar Quotations* provided me with many famous statements.) When you have completed these steps, you are ready for strategic maneuvers.

Strategic Moves

After assembling the masterpiece, you are ready to defend your case and attack others. The real test of an L-D debater is strategic style. The best defense is a good offense, which is the best way to explain defending an L-D case. In addition to a good offense, however, some basic defense moves, such as blocs of arguments with which to respond, will strategically work out well. It is a difficult task to decide how much time needs to be spent emphasizing certain arguments. There are specific negative and affirmative strategies that, through practice rounds, will become apparent. For instance, the seven-minute first negative constructive has to be covered by a four-minute affirmative rebuttal. Obviously, the negative should utilize every second and prepare as many well-thought-out, slowly delivered arguments as can be mustered.

Another aspect of L-D debate is that, with so little preparation time, you have to think on your feet. You as the affirmative can strategically clinch the round if you have the ability to synthesize and adapt yourself and your case. If you manage to cover all your opponent's arguments in a clear, brief, concise sweep and reaffirm your own position, you will have a successful strategy. The more practice rounds you have, however, the more the intricacies of specific affirmative/negative strategies will be revealed.

Specifically, attacks in L-D debate are not made on date comparisons regarding evidence, nor are sources indicated and counter-indicated. Never make sweeping comparisons of policy options. For example, my opponent in final round tried to challenge our Social Security system by comparing it to the European system. I charged her with slipping into policy comparisons. Attacks in L-D are constant comparisons of strengths and weaknesses of each debater's values presentation. Of course, there are some "regular" debate attacks, such as questioning the opponent's logic. There are, however, many new attacks to make, such as whether the opponent established his value, challenged that value, and weighed the two values. If you can do all this in a poised, professional manner, you should do very well in an L-D round.

Delivery Style

The way you sound and look is very important in L-D debate, and, as mentioned, you should strive to be poised and professional. Something personable and yet formal is probably the most successful dress combination, and standards apply to both sexes. The most important thing here is to avoid visual distractions. Loud, lowcut, and loose are features that will not aid your delivery. The major error in appearance seems to be the drive toward the casual. Some debaters dress as if L-D is casual verbal banter. For me, a dark blue suit with a white lace blouse seemed appropriate, but however you are dressed, make sure to look your best.

After checking for visual distractions, the debater needs to look for verbal distractions. I have a terrible habit of frequently saying, "This is the most important argument," in one speech. Stuttering and nervous gestures are distractions that need to be eliminated to obtain a polished performance. No matter how vital the arguments may be, the debater with less polish will be lost in the shuffle. I was fortunate to have not only many competent coaches but also a drama coach to help me remove my delivery distractions. The contestant needs to establish presence even if there is only one member in the audience. Wait until there is an end to the applause, shuffling, or laughter; then begin.

In addition to eliminating bad verbal habits, the debater needs to work on establishing correct habits. For example, an L.D. presentation should be well-organized. Announce that there will be four basic arguments, argue them clearly and succinctly, and after they have been completed, summarize them. If you can implement these simple instructions with your own style, your delivery will become polished. To add a little more polish, try to subtly improve your vocabulary. Debate is an intellectual activity that requires educated communication. You may

think that I have over-emphasized delivery, but in L-D debate, delivery accounts for one-third of the voting rationale. In regular debate, delivery accounts for only one-sixth. Therefore, it is a vital factor to take into account.

If there is one thing I can stress about delivery style, it is to be conscious of its reception. If you are overkilling the opponent who has very little style, mute your delivery style. By the same token, if there is a constant friction of styles between you and your opponent, eliminate the friction. Humor and calm helpfulness provide pleasing effects and help avoid sarcastic, eye-scratching clashes. Just as important to remember is the reaction to the opponent. If the opponent attempts to make depreciating jokes rather than concentrating on the subject matter, recover and adapt quickly. By analyzing the judges' reactions, you can usually sense whether more humor or an even temper will be effective. In general, if a well-versed, nicely dressed, clean-speaking individual delivers a formal, yet clear L-D speech it is likely that delivery has played an effective part in the performance.

Judge Adaptations

Lincoln-Douglas debate is an event that requires much synthesizing and adapting. Some wonder why there is the constant need for reevaluation. Each L-D debater tries to convince each judge that he or she is the better debater. The final decision, though, rests with the judges. No matter what debaters think, judges are always right; therefore, meet their standards. Because the event is so new, confusion about performance standards exists over judging criteria. Students indicate that some judges select a system that is the best policy option or vote for a value that coincides with their own.

I do not believe, however, that these errors can happen in L-D unless the contestants allow it. The contestants must continue to enlighten the judging panel on the methods of judging L-D. Sometimes it is vital to tell the panel that the opponent is in violation of L-D procedure, including accusations of, "But that's public policy debate," or, "There is no value comparison in the round." The best way to persuade a judge that you have the best presentation is to meet the criteria for judging. Most L-D ballots list criteria discussed here: case, delivery, and analysis reasoning as the three voting issues. If you maintain strong achievement levels in all three, you not only help the judge stay on track with the relevance of the round but also help your own performance.

This article has centered on ways to create and assist an L-D debater. I hope that L-D can be better understood and be more enjoyed as it grows as a forensic event. I remember my nervousness in 1980 because I was so unsure about what would happen to me in my rounds. If you simply remember that you can make things happen in this event by a full understanding and execution of L-D principles, you can have a successful L-D experience.

Judging Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Rev. Raymond Hahn

. . . A vague, but keenly felt, sense of panic begins to constrict the throat; breathing becomes labored. . .

"So, I see you've been assigned to judge Lincoln-Douglas debate."

(Rather tremulously) "Yes, but I don't know anything about Lincoln-Douglas!"

"Don't worry. Just remember, Lincoln-Douglas debaters contest a proposition of value and cross-examination debate is over a proposition of policy."

(Looking none the wiser) "Oh!?"

Most judges have been left singularly unenlightened by this now famous distinction of value and policy when encountering Lincoln-Douglas debate for the first time. Even very experienced judges will disagree on the meaning and concrete application of this fundamental notion. Judging decisions and the Lincoln-Douglas ballot itself will be points of unnecessary controversy so long as there exists no more clarity on the nature and purpose of Lincoln-Douglas debate than there is today. Since the nature of the beast has been discussed elsewhere, there is only one point to be made on the question of value before proceeding to a commentary on the Lincoln-Douglas ballot itself.

In debating a proposition of value, it is all too easy to resort to a comparison of the merits of opposing values in the practical realm. In short, values are reduced to their concrete usefulness to simplify points of conflict between the opponents in the round. The confusion over the meaning of value that results only serves to blur the distinction between cross-examination debate and Lincoln-Douglas debate. The difference between what Rieke and Sillars (see Bibliography in Appendix) call "instrumental" and "terminal" values is useful in overcoming such confusion (p. 121).

As these authors describe them, values are not monolithic objects but subjects capable of a variety of attitudes, leading to a number of applications. Simply put, a value can be both thought and acted upon. This latter notion, to which the title, "terminal value" may be put, describes the concept that anything valuable is worth putting into practice. "Instrumental values," on the other hand, identify what is considered to be valuable. Lack of clarity between these two facets of

values is the source of much difficulty for judges who are trying to make a decision in a Lincoln-Douglas debate. If we may assume that the Lincoln-Douglas debater is trying to make a statement about "what" is valuable and why that may be so, then the nature of the newly-proposed National Catholic Forensic League Lincoln-Douglas ballot is considerably clearer. (This ballot appears at the end of this article. Because of the size of this book, it was necessary to extend the ballot to two pages. The original ballot is an 8½" x 14" sheet.)

Consider the series of instructions given to the prospective critic-judge. These instructions are designed to offer some concrete guidelines to the novice and intermediate-level judge.

The first instruction relates to our favorite distinction of value versus policy. Note the emphasis on arguing on the basis of principles, not workability. No plan or plan attacks are to be introduced. Especially important are the "disguised" plan attacks, which are also to be avoided. The Negative (and even the Affirmative) will suggest, ever so subtly, that values must be measured in practice. Values, to be worthwhile, must effectively deal with concrete issues (Undercover plan-meet-need). Then, so long as we are on the issue, the practical ramifications and consequences of such a stance must be explored. The debater now introduces problems that arise when the opponent's position is taken to its logical conclusion (read: Disadvantage). Thus, ever so quietly, we reduce Lincoln-Douglas debate to a briefer form of cross-examination debate.

The lack of clarity, up to this point, in this still developing Forensics category leads to instruction number two. Because of reduced practical experience with this category, simple argumentative guidelines are not available. As a result, the grounds for decision must be discussed in the round, particularly the judgmental basis of which position 1) has the higher value, 2) is the more persuasive, and 3) is technically argued in a superior fashion. In fact, these and other standards of reasonableness in argumentation ought to be included in personal judging criteria and, eventually, be taken for granted. For the present, they are eminently debatable. We must allow the debaters to establish the criteria on which their value propositions must be judged. This is the true art of persuasion, for the student must convince the critic-judge of the merits of the position without being able to rely on stock approaches. Learning to approach each judge and debate uniquely is an excellent beginning for this style of debate and much more appropriate to Lincoln-Douglas debate. It is also superior to begging the critic-judge to "be a policy-maker."

This brings us to the third and fifth instructions, which will be considered together. These two attempt to set some basis for the judging criteria to be used in the round. The need for this manual on Lincoln-Douglas debate is made clear by the paucity of clear guidelines available. But note that persuasion on validity, communication, and support for argumentation (both in terms of logic and evidence) are listed as criteria. Recall that values are abstract but that we all establish priorities in our value systems. Such systems of priorities always have reasons behind them. The debater ought to be able to present convincing reasons for his particular system of priorities. These reasons ought to be convincing enough on which to vote a decision. Appeals to authority and tradition, and conformity to the critic-judge's value system (for all decisions are subjective) may be used to persuade.

We all constantly use this kind of approach in our daily lives. How often do we convince our neighbors or friends that the principle of voluntary charity, for example, is superior to government aid by claiming that government spending will cause a trade war, kill thousands of kidney patients, or lead to World War IV (World War III having been precipitated by an earlier speech)? Standards for normal conversational discussion by intelligent individuals can be readily adapted as criteria for decision making in Lincoln-Douglas debate.

A note of caution is in order, however. Though the NCFL ballot has its virtues in regard to emphasizing the difference between Lincoln-Douglas and cross-examination debate, the reader should not be led to the conclusion that "anyone can judge Lincoln-Douglas." Rather, the emphasis on value, principle, and persuasion ought to draw the argumentation and decision making to a different plane. The application of logical thought to controversial questions for the simple desire of accuracy and truth is a worthwhile and vital pursuit. It is no less a task than the practical implementation of such principles. To claim that no value has worth if it is not practical is to deny our ability to approve anything for its own sake. This leads us inevitably to complete and ever-transitory subjectivity.

The innate worth of value-debate may be illustrated by this quotation from the introduction to James McElligott's popular nineteenth-century manual, *The American Debater*:

In a community thus liable to abuse from the prevalence and pertinacity of ill-founded opinion, where change, under the name of reform, treats all experience as mere imbecility, and where, on the other hand, blind adherence to things as they are, under the name of wise conservatism, opposed tenaciously every effort at progress, some power of logical analysis seems necessary to see, if nothing more, that even real reform and real progress are not fatally obstructed in the contest. This power finds a ready and flexible application in the person of an accomplished debater. It is attainable by practice. It is capable of indefinite improvement. It is serviceable in every station. It is full of benefit to all that use it aright.

The contributions of Mr. Richard Sodikow, of Bronx High School of Science, and Ms. Dale McCall, published elsewhere in this manual, in the construction of the NCFL Lincoln-Douglas debate ballot must be gratefully acknowledged. Only the press of other business constrained Mr. Sodikow, the chairman of the committee, from composing this article himself.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC FORENSIC LEAGUE

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

Round _____ Room _____ Date _____ Judge _____

Affirmative _____ Points _____ Negative _____ Points _____
Name & Code Name & Code

Instructions to the Judges

1. Unlike team debate, the resolution to be debated will be a proposition of *value*, rather than a proposition of *policy*. Thus, the youngsters are encouraged to develop argumentation on conflict underlying principles to support their positions. To that end, they are *not* responsible for practical applications. There is no *need* for a plan (or for plan attacks).
2. The burdens on the affirmative and negative positions are not *prescribed* as they may be in debates on propositions of policy; therefore, decision rules are fair issues to be argued in the round.
3. In making your decision, you might ask yourself the following questions:
 - a. Which debater persuaded you that his position was more valid? (Which debater communicated more effectively?)
 - b. Did the debater support his position appropriately, using logical argumentation throughout, and evidence where necessary?
4. *Rate* each debater's performance by assigning points to each on the following scale of 0 to 30.

Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
0-15	16-20	21-25	26-30

The points you award must correlate with your decision.
5. Remember, this *is* debate and *not* unrelated individual oration.
6. The debate will follow these time limits:

Affirmative constructive	6 minutes
Cross-examination by negative	3 "
Negative constructive	7 "
Affirmative cross-examination	3 "
Affirmative rebuttal	4 "
Negative rebuttal	6 "
Affirmative rebuttal	3 "

COMMENTS AND REASONS FOR DECISION

In my opinion, the debate was won by _____ upholding the (aff.) (neg.)

Signature of judge _____

Strategy of Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Alex L. Pritchard

In the past two years, interest in Lincoln-Douglas debate has grown tremendously. Because of the growth of this activity and the lack of literature on strategy and tactics of Lincoln-Douglas debate (LD), it is important to consider specific affirmative and negative strategies for L-D debate.

Initial Preparation

When a student first begins to work on an L-D debate topic, there are several things to be kept in mind. Analyzing the wording of the topic is the first consideration. Each important word or phrase should be researched to obtain a thorough understanding of the definition as well as contextual meanings. Along this line, the debater, whether affirmative or negative, should try to define terms so as to gain some strategic advantage consistent with an overall strategy. The debater should not distort meanings or "beg the question" in order to gain an advantage, but the affirmative might find it advantageous to define terms more broadly or the negative to define the terms more narrowly. A broader definition gives the affirmative more latitude in debating, and a narrow definition makes the negative's job of research easier.

Another consideration is to choose values or criteria that have the most positive connotations. Some values or philosophies are more acceptable than others to the average L-D judge. For example, socialism might be a very defensible economic philosophy, but it is probably safe to assume that capitalism has greater public appeal in the United States. The debater must keep in mind that first impressions are very important and that careful consideration must be given to the connotations of the values supported. In general, the values or criteria should be easy to explain, should be concise, and should have commonsense appeal. In choosing specific values, it is important to choose values that have stood the test of time. Such values might include liberty, justice, individualism, or utilitarianism, just to mention a few. These are topics on which there is a great deal of research and writing, and there can be strong arguments on either side of the debate.

General Argumentation Strategy

Whether the debater is defending the affirmative or the negative side of the resolution, there are basic strategies to consider in constructing arguments for L-D debate.

First of all, it is best to start with two or three major contentions to support the debate case rather than attempting to make five or six arguments in a seven-minute speech and still provide the necessary explanations. When too many arguments are being made by both speakers, the amount of clash becomes very limited, and L-D debate then becomes nothing but two speakers giving oratories.

A second rule to keep in mind when constructing the speech is to avoid arguments that require lengthy development. If it takes three minutes to make the argument clear, it is very likely that the judges and the audience will lose interest. Even highly complex arguments should be concisely worded so that the impact of the argument is clear within a short period of time.

Thirdly, many forms of inductive and deductive reasoning could be discussed here in building the constructive arguments in L-D debate; however, to simplify things as much as possible, the best way to prove contentions is by using credible sources and carefully selected examples to illustrate the points. In the first speech for both the affirmative and the negative, extensive use of references from well-known experts or philosophers is necessary to build a strong case. Each source need not be quoted verbatim, but reference to the authors will add credibility to the speech. In addition, choosing good examples makes the arguments clearer to the judge. The winner in the 1981 National Forensics League L-D debate final round very effectively used the examples of Viet Nam and Iran to point out problems in our past foreign policies. Certainly these two examples provide vivid pictures to most Americans of the tragedies in recent American history. These types of examples are most beneficial in L-D debate for stressing the intended point.

The last general strategy to keep in mind is to try and group the opponent's arguments wherever possible. If it is legitimate to answer two of the opponent's arguments with only one argument of your own, you will save precious time in your speech. Many debaters feel that each of the opposition's arguments should be dealt with individually, but often this only wastes time. This grouping of arguments needs to be done carefully, because a misanalysis of the arguments can result in no refutation at all. This mistake can lead to lack of clash and poor debating.

Affirmative Strategies

The preceding comments are very important general strategies for constructing affirmative and negative arguments. There are also some specific ideas that will be particularly helpful for the affirmative debater.

The first idea for the construction of the affirmative case is to preempt expected negative arguments. After sufficient research, the affirmative debater should be able to anticipate two or three major negative arguments. The first affirmative has the advantage of going first in the debate and should maximize this advantage by attacking the anticipated negative arguments. This should not be done defensively so that the affirmative position appears weak. By showing how

anticipated negative arguments are irrelevant or insignificant, the affirmative can gain three advantages. First, the affirmative can diminish the negative contention simply by having the first chance to explain the arguments to the judge and tell why they are irrelevant. Secondly, preempting the negative attack means that the negative must respond to the argument even before actually presenting the argument, thus making the negative look very defensive. Thirdly, preempting means that the negative may choose to go ahead and argue the point even if that particular argument was not a part of the negative's strategy. In other words, even if the affirmative anticipates incorrectly, the negative may be lured into debating arguments that he or she was not prepared to debate. This forces the negative to debate on the "affirmative ground," which usually means victory for the affirmative.

The second area of affirmative strategy deals with the first rebuttal speech. (Remember, the affirmative gets two rebuttals, the negative only one.) The first affirmative rebuttal is the most important speech for the affirmative debater. Usually this speech turns the tide one way or the other in the debate. The affirmative must cover the seven minutes of negative arguments in only four minutes. It is important that the affirmative make prepared arguments (briefs) in anticipation of the negative constructive speech. Since most L-D rules allow only one minute of preparation between speeches, the debaters must organize arguments in advance in order to be thoroughly prepared.

The primary strategy in the first affirmative rebuttal is to spend no more than three minutes on the negative arguments and then to go back and extend and support the arguments made from the first affirmative constructive. If the affirmative does not have time to extend arguments from the first speech, the judge will surely forget them by the last rebuttal. It is particularly important to point out arguments that the negative has either ignored or misanalyzed. If the affirmative can maintain this three minute/one minute time allocation, pressure will be placed on the negative to deal with the major affirmative arguments. The affirmative can then spend less time on his or her own constructive arguments. It is very obvious that the affirmative debater is losing when all of the first rebuttal is spent in refuting the negative arguments, not in talking about affirmative constructive arguments. If the suggested time allocation does take place, the debate is once again on "affirmative ground," and the affirmative has the needed advantage going into the last rebuttal.

In the last affirmative rebuttal, the primary goal is to return to the major negative arguments, explain why they are invalid or insignificant when compared to the affirmative arguments, and then extend and summarize the two or three major contentions from the first affirmative constructive. The strategy here involves those judges who have taken notes, for they would likely have noted the first affirmative constructive since it should have been carefully outlined. Even for the judge who does not take notes, the first affirmative constructive should still be the easiest speech to remember because it was so persuasive and so clearly written. Therefore, returning to the affirmative's major contentions should be persuasive enough to garner the victory. It is very important that the first two minutes be spent primarily on the affirmative arguments. The debater will sound as if he or she is losing if all the time is spent answering the negative attacks.

In general, directly refuting the negative arguments is not necessary to win. In some cases, directly refuting the opponent's arguments might be the best strategy, but the affirmative can usually win the debate by showing that the affirmative values are superior to the negative values, which does not require the traditional direct refutation approach. The ability to synthesize and prioritize all the arguments in the debate and to put them in proper perspective for the judge is the key strategy.

Negative Strategies

The first strategy for the negative debater is to lay out for the judge the criteria the debater thinks the judge should use for deciding on a proposition of value. These criteria should be extensively researched and supported by evidence and reasoning. While the negative is doing this, the analysis should demonstrate why the negative's criteria for judging values are superior to the affirmative's approach. This argument can be prepared in advance and adapted to the affirmative approach in the debate. Without criteria, there are no standards to judge the debate, and in propositions of value, too much of the decision is subject to the judge's personal preferences.

The negative debater must prepare about four minutes of constructive arguments in defense of the negative position. The last three minutes of the constructive speech should be specific refutation against the affirmative arguments and criteria. If the negative debater spends all seven minutes refuting the affirmative speech, then the judge has only reasons to vote *against* the affirmative but no reasons to vote *for* the negative. As mentioned in the affirmative strategies, if the negative spends most of the time debating the affirmative arguments, the debate quickly shifts to "affirmative ground," and the affirmative is practically guaranteed victory. Therefore, the best negative strategy is a strong offense against the resolution and should be delivered first in the constructive speech in order to be most persuasive.

The negative can consider many possible strategies, depending on the type of arguments the affirmative makes. In general, when the negative is attempting to refute the affirmative arguments, the best strategy is to attack the supportive arguments and examples. Too often the negative debater attempts to refute the affirmative values by saying, "Democracy is not important." Unfortunately, this is not very persuasive to many people in the United States, and the negative takes on a terrible burden to prove such a statement. Instead, the debater needs to argue against the examples and supportive evidence. In most L-D debates, the support is either insufficient, inaccurate, or invalid to prove what the debater is attempting to say. Since most topics are asking for a value judgement, the negative debater needs to show that the negative's values are more important to most Americans than are the affirmative's.

In conjunction with the preceding idea is the strategy of using presumption. Presumption is usually defined in debate as the idea that "the present way of doing things should remain until sufficient reason for change is given." There are sound theoretical reasons why presumption should not exist in a proposition of values, but for the present time, presumption does become an

issue in the minds of many L-D judges. When the wording of propositions imply a burden on the affirmative to show that something is more important than something else (for example, government honesty is more important than national security) or that something new should receive higher priority (for example, human rights should be a more important priority in foreign policy), the negative can then take advantage of such wording. On many occasions, debaters have won by showing that the affirmative did not prove that something was more important (or only of equal importance) than the negative value. It is to the advantage of the negative to point out that the affirmative does have the additional burden implied by the resolution, at least until the wording of L-D topics becomes more equitable for both sides.

In debating the negative rebuttal, it is necessary to keep in mind the same type of time allocation strategies used by the affirmative. Since the negative constructive is seven minutes and the first affirmative rebuttal is only four minutes, the negative rebuttalist should concentrate on answering the four minutes of arguments in a maximum of three minutes. If this can be accomplished, then the negative should have destroyed the affirmative arguments and should still have three minutes to extend and support constructive arguments. The affirmative is forced in the last rebuttal to spend all the time on the negative constructive attacks, having little time to resurrect affirmative arguments. This means that the debate has shifted to "negative ground," which should bode well for the negative debater. If the negative has truly crushed the affirmative arguments, it would take the entire time of the last speaker just to revive his or her own arguments, let alone do any damage to the negative constructive attack. I would point out that, with some inexperienced debaters, all the time in the world would not be sufficient to resurrect arguments, but for the experienced debater, the idea of time allocation means the difference between victory and defeat.

Delivery

Since the purpose of this article is to discuss strategy and not technique, I will confine my remarks on delivery to only the strategic considerations. At many tournaments, L-D judges are lay judges or speech judges and have very little training in debate. For that reason, the L-D debater must be a skilled speaker and a superb communicator. The major consideration in delivery as a strategy is to work on "word economy." The best L-D debaters are those who can speak slowly, cover many arguments, and eliminate unnecessary words. For the traditional debate judge, ignoring or "dropping" an argument is a major mistake. This happens in L-D debate primarily because the debater chose to orate on one single point at the expense of other arguments. This approach may win a few ballots, but the debaters who consistently win are those who can cover many arguments in a short amount of time. Word economy comes with careful preparation of the arguments in advance and from extensive practice. For these reasons, most of the successful L-D debaters are those who have experience in both traditional debate and individual events. The ability to put together the quick thinking of extemporaneous speaking, the mastery of communication through oratory, and the argumentation training of debate will make the best L-D debaters.

Lincoln-Douglas debate is such a new event in high school that little has been written about the strategy of this activity. As experience increases, it is hoped that knowledge about strategy will also increase. Until that time, the preceding discussion might serve as a starting point for strategic planning in Lincoln-Douglas debate.

Appendix

First Affirmative Constructive in Final Round NFL Tournament, June 1980

Mary C. Ambrose

Our forefathers instilled many principles of government within us. One of the most important of these values, I believe, is the value of self-sufficiency. This value was eloquently expressed by Abraham Lincoln when he elucidated that "the object of a government is to do for a community of people whatever they have to have done for themselves but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well in their separate and individual capacities." In 1935, the Social Security System was created on the basis of this self-sufficient value, and as a result, today the system serves 35 million people, providing over 103 billion dollars in funds.

Tonight as we measure the value of self-sufficiency, we can reaffirm the Lincoln-Douglas debate topic that "The strengths of the present methods of funding the Social Security System do indeed outweigh the weaknesses."

Simply put, four elements of the current funding methods combine to guarantee that self-sufficiency be realized. These are the Social Security wage base, the tax rate, the contingency reserve, and cost-of-living increases. Social Security establishes these remarkable funding mechanisms to metamorphize the small structural problems into assets for the system. For instance to overcome demographic and financial weaknesses in pre-1977, many revisions were employed to end an internal cash flow shortage and malignant maldistribution of baby boom population. At this time we can see many mechanisms at work.

The first element that insures self-sufficiency is the contribution and benefit base. This allows the Social Security System to operate on a firm financial base. The base was changed to allow for a supplemental increase in the wage base 1979-81. Specifically \$21,000, the maximum taxable income formerly, has been raised to \$29,700. Taxable payroll increase went 85.91%, subject to tax.

The metamorphosis of this mechanism allows that, during the next 75 years, one-half the increase in the tax income will pay additional costs due to higher benefits. Net result will decrease future debts .5% of taxable payroll. Because of this contribution and benefit base, self-sufficiency in financing is guaranteed.

But yet a second funding mechanism provides self-sufficiency — that is the 1977 amendment to provide increases in the tax rate. The old law, which set the tax rate at 6.0% in 1978 now will

rise in steps to 6.45% in 1986. The allocation of taxes among the Old Age Survival Disability Insurance (OASDI), Health Insurance (HI), and Supplementary Medical Insurance (SMI) changed in order to prevent the depletion of the OASDI.

Under the old law, tax income during the ten-year period 1978-88 was projected to be 1.6 trillion dollars. Under the new law, the tax income during the same period is projected to be 1.9 trillion. This is an increase of over 227 billion dollars, a 14% increase. A tax rate increase is definitely a mechanism that insures self-sufficiency in financing.

The third mechanism is known as contingency reserve. Alice Rivlin reported that, from 1937-77, a total of \$743 billion collected only \$707 billion outlays. A \$40 billion surplus was put in bonds called contingency reserve. Thus, the surpluses accrued have been set aside to provide sound financing in times of economic fluctuations.

Finally, even if prices skyrocket and economic woes occur, the Social Security financing mechanisms are so sound that additional outlays can be sustained. On May 5, 1980, *U.S. News and World Report* established that visible benefits of the Social Security financing exists, for 35 million recipients will get a cost of living increase of 14.3% in July.

Overall, we can visualize that the social security funding mechanisms work. Since the three funds — OASDI, HI, and SMI — together have a surplus, Alice Rivlin reported that the overall solvency of Social Security was expected to strengthen over the next five years, with revenues exceeding expenses by about \$23 billion.

Lest one think that the Social Security self-sufficiency has been based on a shortsighted vision of five years, Robert Ball concluded that the system is soundly financed. According to official cost estimates, the programs will have sufficient funds to cover costs for the next 50 years.

I ask that, more than anything else, two concepts be remembered. First of all, the system has operated successfully for 45 years, and if the weaknesses truly outweighed the strengths, the system would have collapsed long ago. Secondly, please realize that all arguments must center around the value of self-sufficiency.

Herbert Hoover once said that words without actions are the assassins of idealism. In 1977, you were given the words; in 1980, you see the actions that back up the words. Now you see that the value of self-sufficiency has not been assassinated but exists today in the Social Security financing.

Bibliography

Lincoln-Douglas and Values Debate

- Angle, Paul M. *Created Equal? The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Colburn, C. William. *Strategies for Educational Debate*. Boston: Holbrook Press, 1972, pp. 18-23.
- Dennis, Frank L. *The Lincoln-Douglas Debates*. New York: Mason & Lipscomb, 1974.
- Dick, Robert C. *Argumentation and Rational Debating*. Dubuque: William C. Brown, 1972, pp. 12-14.
- Dobkin, Milton. "Social Values and Public Address: Some Implications for Pedagogy." *Western Speech Journal*, 26 (1962), 140-45.
- Fryar, Maridell, and David A. Thomas. *Basic Debate*. Skokie: National Textbook Co., 1972, pp. 12-16.
- . *Student Congress and Lincoln-Douglas Debate*. Skokie: National Textbook Co., 1981.
- Hample, Dale. "Testing a Model of Value Argument and Evidence." *Communication Monographs*, 44 (1977), 106-20.
- Hensley, Dana, and Diana Prentice. *Mastering Competitive Debate*, 2nd ed. Caldwell: Clark, 1982, Appendix D.
- Klopf, Donald W., and James C. McCroskey. *The Elements of Debate*. New York: Arco, 1969, pp. 63-64.
- Matlon, Ronald J. "Debating Propositions of Value." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 14 (1978), 194-204.
- . "Propositions of Value: An Inquiry into Issue Analysis and the Laws of Presumption." In *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation*. Ed. George Ziegelmüller and Jack Rhodes. American Forensic Association and SCA, 1981, pp. 494-512.

- McBurney, James H., and Glen Mills. *Argumentation and Debate: Techniques of a Free Society*. 2nd ed. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1964, pp. 47-50.
- Miller, Gerald R. "Questions of Fact and Value: Another Look." *Southern Speech Journal*, 28 (1962), 116-22.
- Ehninger, Douglas, and Wayne Brockriede, eds. *Decision by Debate*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1978, pp. 159-61.
- Rieke, Richard D., and Malcolm O. Sillars. *Argumentation and the Decision Making Process*. New York: John Wiley, 1975, pp. 60-71; 115-36.
- Ross, Mary D. *A Coaches' Guide to Lincoln-Douglas Debate*. Speech and Theatre Association of Missouri, 1981.
- Sillars, Malcolm O. "Audience, Social Values, and the Analysis of Argument." *The Speech Teacher*, 22 (1973), 291-303.
- Spillman, Bonnie. "The Impact of Value and Self-Esteem Messages in Persuasion." *Central States Speech Journal*, 50 (1979), 67-74.
- Steele, Edward. "Social Values, the Enthymene, and Speech Criticism." *Western Speech Journal*, 26 (1962), 70-75.
- Thomas, David A. *Lincoln-Douglas Debate*. National Federation of State High School Associations, 1981. (Includes a tape and handout)
- Thomas, David A., and Maridell Fryar. "Value Resolutions, Presumption, and Stock Issues." In *Dimensions of Argument: Proceedings of the Second Summer Conference on Argumentation*. Ed. George Ziegelmüller and Jack Rhodes. American Forensics Association and SCA, 1981, pp. 513-31.
- Wenzel, Joseph W. "Toward a Rationale for Value-Centered Argument." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 13 (1977), 150-58.
- Wenzel, Joseph W., and Dale J. Hample. "Categories and Dimensions of Value Propositions: Exploratory Studies." *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 11 (1975), 121-31.
- Young, Marilyn. "The Use of Evidence in Value Argument: A Suggestion." In *Proceedings of the Summer Conference on Argumentation*. Ed. Jack Rhodes and Sara Newell. Speech Communication Association and American Forensic Association, 1980, pp. 287-95.
- Ziegelmüller, George, and Charles A. Danse. *Argumentation, Inquiry and Advocacy*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1975, pp. 14-15.

Values

- Albert, Ethel M. "Conflict and Change in American Values: A Cultural-Historical Approach." *Ethics*, 74 (Oct. 1963), 19-33.
- Arrow, Kenneth J. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Brandner, Lowell, and Joan Sistrunk. "The Newspaper: Molder or Mirror of Community Values." *Journalism Quarterly*, 43 (1966), 497-504.
- Castell, J. Doyle, and Robert J. Stahl. *Value Clarification in the Classroom: A Primer*. Santa Monica: Goodyear, 1975.
- Chaffee, Steven H. "Salience and Pertinence as Sources of Value Change." *Journal of Communication*, 17 (1967), 25-38.
- Inlow, Gart M. *Values in Transition: A Handbook*. New York: John Wiley, 1972.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. "The Evolution of Contemporary American Values." *Daedalus*, 87, (1958), 78-109.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. "The Expression of Value in Political Documents." *Journalism Quarterly*, 47 (1970), 510-18.
- Lepley, Ray. *The Language of Values*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- McEdwards, Mary G. "American Values: Circa 1920-1970." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 57 (1971), 173-80.
- Morison, Elting E., ed. *The American Style: Essays in Value and Performance*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- Morris, Charles, "Values, Problematic and Unproblematic, and Science." *Journal of Communication*, 11 (1961), 205-210.
- Nelson, Jack L. *Values in Society*. Rochelle Park: Hayden, 1975.
- Rokeach, Milton. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Rous, Gerald L., and Dorothy E. Lee. "Freedom and Equality: Two Values of Political Orientation." *Journal of Communication*, 28 (1978), 45-51.

Simon, Sidney, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirshenbaum. *Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategy for Teachers and Students*. New York: Hart, 1972.

Steele, Edward D., and W. Charles Redding. "The American Value System: Premises for Persuasion." *Western Speech Journal*, 26 (1962), 83-91.

Stevenson, Charles L. *Facts and Values: Studies in Ethical Analysis*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

Van Mering, Otto. *A Grammar of Human Values*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961.