

Advocacy Speech

This first assignment asks that you to argue one side of an issue of your choice. You must present evidence of a significant social problem that can be solved by a change in American policy. You must advocate a solution to the problem, and present evidence that your solution is workable. Basically, the speech comprises your main claim and a series of quotations from journals, periodicals, newspapers, and books, linked by transitions written by you, which support your claim. Your presentation must be 5-7 minutes long and contain **at least 5 different credible sources**. You must verbally cite the source, the source's qualification, and the date of publication, but not the page number.

Mechanics

The most important aspect of this assignment is selecting the right support for your position. The sources that you cite should be respected in their field (i.e., don't cite *Vogue*, Lady Gaga, or anything that resembles *Soap Opera Weekly* unless your speech is about those things.) Internet sites that cannot be evaluated by the listener (e.g., www.specsite96~/working.html) may not be used. You must include the author's name, his or her qualification, the publication in which the quotation appeared, and the date. The page number must be included on the manuscript, although you should not verbally state it.

The structure of the speech is as follows:

1. Presentation of the problem (harms).
2. Which action must be taken to solve the problem (policy).
3. The workability of the plan (solvency).

Your manuscript should, of course, be free of grammatical blunders, typos, and spelling errors 😊.

Delivery

The speech may be read from your manuscript, a copy of which **will be turned in before your speech**. Eye contact and a certain amount of passion and/or energy are required to maximize your points. Therefore, PRACTICE! (with a timer, in order to determine if you have enough or too much material).

Questions challenging your claim and support will be asked at the completion of your presentation.

There is an abbreviated sample of the assignment on the next page.

Advocacy Speech Abbreviated Sample

Public outrage in the early 90s prompted politicians and crime-weary citizens to demand that drug offenders be locked away for life. But the get-tough campaign is colliding with the reality of a prison system bursting at the seams. Mandatory prison terms are not working and should be replaced by rehabilitation for nonviolent drug offenders.

The present system is a drain on society, as I note in:

1. ENFORCEMENT COSTS HAVE REACHED MASSIVE PROPORTIONS

John Heard, Professor of Criminal Justice, Columbia University (**warrant**), The Economist, January 7, 2001, p. 27.

The Drug War currently costs the United States three billion dollars a year. Over two hundred thousand law enforcement officers, DEA agents, lawyers, and judges are needed just to keep up with the present demand. And the problem is not going away. The legal system has become a revolving door where drug offenders are arrested, convicted, imprisoned, and released, only to start the cycle over again. The annual cost of keeping an inmate is about \$35,000, according to the bureau of prisons, and almost half of all prisoners are there for drug-related offences, many for mandatory terms. The United States now spends more on criminal justice than education. Observes Jerome Miller, president of the National Center on Institutions, "we're trading textbooks for prisons."

Some might argue that drug offenders deserve to be locked away for good, but mandatory sentences are not the answer, as we see in:

2. OUR PRISONS ARE SERIOUSLY OVERCROWDED

Houston Chronicle, February 2, 1999, p. 12

Two-tier metal bunks, in rows less than three feet apart divide the basketball court at the medium-security prison in Jessup, Md. Designed to incarcerate 500 inmates when it opened in 1981, the prison now holds 1,140 of the state's convict population...One of the worst situations confronted Texas, where the prison population has doubled. In response to a lawsuit, Texas Judge William Justice declared the state prison system unconstitutional, describing facilities as "strained beyond their limitations, creating a malignant effect on all aspects of inmate life." Some prisons have started releasing violent felons in order to keep those sentenced to mandatory minimums in jail.

Drug enforcement has not worked. We will not see an end to the drug problem in our nation until we stem the demand. The only way to solve this problem is to replace incarceration with treatment. This solution will work, as is shown in:

3. DRUG REHABILITATION WILL SOLVE THE DRUG CRISIS IN AMERICA

Newsweek, November 2000, p. 33

Drug treatment for nonviolent drug offenders is the only reasonable solution to the drug problem that plagues our cities. A pilot program in New York called Phoenix House has shown that intensive in-patient rehabilitation works for 82 percent of the recipients. This is a better, and less expensive solution than incarceration, where the vast majority of inmates re-offend within a year after release

Evidenced Parliamentary Debate

For this assignment, as for all the debates, you will be partnered with another student. You may choose your own partner, or I will assign one to you. It is up to the two of you to decide who will be in the leader position (Prime Minister, Leader of the Opposition) and who will be in the member position (Member of Government, Member of the Opposition). Although the leader position has more speeches, the member position is equally important. You will be evaluated individually, and your grade will not be influenced by which position you hold.

Requirements

Each debate team and their opponents will be assigned a fact or value resolution 1-2 weeks before the debate. A fact proposition is usually identified by use of the word “is,” or “has;” a value proposition by the implication that something is better, or more valued, than something else. It will be the government’s responsibility to construct and be prepared to defend a case that supports the resolution. It will be the opposition’s responsibility to be prepared to attack likely government arguments and offer counter examples to upholding the resolution. Both teams will need to research the topic and be prepared to **read evidence from experts** during the debate (a minimum of 3 different sources are required, 5 are recommended). Speech times are as follows:

Prime Minister constructive	5 minutes
Leader of Opposition constructive	5 minutes
Member of Government constrictive	5 minutes
Member of Opposition constructive	5 minutes
Leader of Opposition rebuttal	2 minutes
Prime Minister rebuttal	2 minutes

Structure

The structure of the case depends upon the resolution. Both fact and value propositions require that the government define important terms and offer criteria for determining who won the debate. Additionally, value resolutions require that a specific value be given, (and justified) that the government’s case will uphold.

- For a fact resolution, the criteria is generally, “if we show by a preponderance of the evidence, that the resolution is true, we will win the debate.”
- For a value resolution, the criteria is generally “if we show that we best uphold the value of _____ (whatever value that was offered), we will win the debate.”

In addition to offering a criteria and possibly a value, the government team can offer, if they wish, resolutional analysis. This is anything that the government believes is necessary to clarify their interpretation of the resolution. The government should use recent evidence (direct quotations) from reputable sources, and analysis to support their positions. The opposition should use evidence wherever possible, but should also use analysis and logic to attack the government’s case.

It is desirable to respond to each point that the other team makes (clash) and to bring up arguments of your own that oppose the resolution (off-case). To respond to each of your opponent’s arguments, it is necessary to keep track of what has been said.

On the next page is a sample debate “flow.”

Sample Evidenced Parliamentary Debate Flow

Resolved: This house believes that the death penalty is undesirable

PMC	LOC	MGC	MOC	LOR	PMR
RES ANAL:					
DP:= executions VALUE: Justice Justice greatest value, key to US const./democ.	Agree Opp proves DP unjust	→			
CONT. 1: DP BIASED					
A. ↑ minorities exec <i>Prof. Brown 10</i>	Not racist more mnority killers	Assertion			VOTER1: DP BIASD
B. Poor cant afford good lawyers	1. Better lawyer for DP 2. Wont end ↑minority Convictns	Not reason for DP Better prison than dead	non responsive	Gov dropped not racist, more minority killers	
CONT 2: DP ARBITRY					
A. States punish dif Ex. TX, FL. <i>LA Times 1/10</i>	1. Mandated sentences takes away discretion 2. Local standards best	1. Discretion led to DP cos soft judges	If extenuating circ. still can get life w/o parole Drop → Grants local stds best		All killers should get life w/o parole—deterrent Dropped dif sentences VOTER2: DP ARBIT
B. Defendants get dif sentences same crime <i>Jl Jurisprudence 06</i>					
C. =>Unequal justice	Juries determine				
CONT 3: INOC ENT DIE					
A. Innocent are executed <i>Newsweek 3/10</i>	1. Don't abolish, fix. 2. DNA prevents mistakes	Only where phys ev present.	Drop → Limit DP to those cases	Gov grants keep DP but fix	
B. Freedom Proj <i>Barry Scheck 06</i>	Shows sys works	XA only where phys ev present	XA limit DP		VOTER 3: INCT DIE Freedm Proj proves
C. Ultimate injust	No ev innocent ever died <i>Yale Law Review 05</i>			extend no innocent ever executed	
CONT 4: INT'L CONDEM					
A. US called HR abuser					
B. Nations wont extradite <i>LA Times 1/09</i>	Waive DP in int'l cases				
OFF-CASE					
	1. Decr. deterrent = more crime ↓ justice <i>Prof. White 01</i>	1. DP not a deterrent <i>CQ Resercher 05</i>	DP deters crime <i>Gallup Poll 06</i>	VOTER 1: NO DP => ↑ CRIME	
		2. Old ev			Dropped ev is old
	2. Cost of keeping in prison too high <i>Newsweek Oct 04</i>	↳ Costs more to execute <i>NYTimes Mar 06</i>	That's changing w/ streamlining		
	3. Dead never kill again Ex: Richard Allen	Life without parole	Liberal parole boards make imposs	Mandate life w/o par VOTER 2: LIFE SOLVS	

Parliamentary Debate # 2

This debate is very similar to your first debate. The two major differences are that there will be **no evidence read** in the round—all support must come from memorized facts, logical arguments, examples, and analogies—and the proposition will not be fact or value, it will be a proposition of policy.

Requirements

Each debate team and their opponents will be assigned a policy resolution 1-2 weeks before the debate. You can tell a policy proposition by the words “would” or “should” in the topic. Again, it will be the government’s responsibility to construct and be prepared to defend a case that supports the resolution. It will be the opposition’s responsibility to be prepared to negate the resolution by arguing topicality, if appropriate, attacking the case, and preparing general disadvantages to upholding the resolution. While evidence is not read during the round, it may be cited from memory. Since one policy cannot solve everything, broad policy resolutions must be parametricized.

Structure

The structure of the government’s case is similar to that of the advocacy speech. **The government must present harms, plan, and solvency.** Harms are all the bad stuff that is occurring in the status quo, the plan is what policy you would change or institute, and solvency is how the plan will solve the harms. It is also good to have advantages, which are the side benefits (unrelated to the harms) that you realize from plan. **The opposition must attack arguments that the government presents (clash) and offer disadvantages (off-case) to passing the plan.**

The government must provide appropriate criteria on which the debate will be judged. For a policy debate the criteria is generally “net benefits,” “on balance,” or “if advantages outweigh disadvantages.” They all mean basically the same. In this debate, **points of information are required**, and points of order should be used when appropriate.

Speech times are as follows:

Prime Minister constructive	6 minutes
Leader of Opposition constructive	6 minutes
Member of Government constrictive	6 minutes
Member of Opposition constructive	6 minutes
Leader of Opposition rebuttal*	3 minutes
Prime Minister rebuttal*	3 minutes

*No new arguments are allowed, only rebuttal and/or rebuilding of old arguments.

You must turn in your Argument Paper (see syllabus), written on the topic of your debate, at the start of class on the day you are scheduled to debate.

There is a sample body of a policy case on the next page. It shows appropriate detail and structure.

Sample Policy Case (Top of Case not included)

HARMS—The lion.

1. The African lion is being wiped out.
 - A. Lions are being poisoned at a staggering rate in Kenya, and there is little chance a cub outside the wildlife reserves will make it to adulthood.
 - B. 20 years ago there were 200,000 lions in Africa; today there are only 30,000.
 - C. Dr. Laurence Frank of UC Berkeley said on *60 Minutes* March 30, 2009 that he believes that due to poison, the lion will be extinct in Africa.
 - D. When a dominant species such as the lion disappears, it destroys the eco balance. Species that the lion preys upon overpopulate, and they then wipe out species they prey upon. The cycle continues down the chain.

2. Furadan is to blame.
 - A. Furadan is a cheap, deadly American poison. Highly concentrated in its granular form, just a tiny amount from a \$2 bottle like this one is enough to kill an entire pride of lions. Designed as a pesticide, it has been banned in the granular form in Europe the United States.
 - B. Furadan, called “the blue stuff” can be bought in towns and villages all over Kenya, in places where no crops are grown.
 - C. Cows are a cash crop in Kenya, and after lions kill livestock, ranchers poison the carcass so that the lions that eat it die. “There have been 30-40 poisonings in the study area,” said Dr. Frank, “but that’s the tiny tip of the iceberg.” Furadan kills indiscriminately, wiping out hyenas, leopards, jackals, vultures and other birds in droves.

INHERENCY

Furadan is made by FMC, inc., a US corp. and legally exported to Africa in granular form.

PLAN

USFG will ban granulated Furadan globally.

FTNM—Plan will cost no money; Enforcement through the EPA

SOLVENCY

Banning granular Furadan would save the lion. Richard Bonham, a Kenyan naturalist, recognizes that time is running out. "It just became very clear unless we step in and make some sort of intervention, [to ban Furadan] we are gonna lose the lion," Bonham said.

ADVANTAGE 1—CULTURE

- A. Prior to western chemicals, offending lions were hunted with spears.
- B. It was a traditional rite of passage in the Masai culture in Kenya for a young man to kill a lion with a spear, signaling his entry into manhood. This tradition is dying out as the need to hunt with spears is replaced.
- C. Banning Furadan will mean that the Masai will revert to their traditional methods.

ADVANTAGE 1—TOURISM

- A. According to *CBS News* on March 29, 2009, hundreds of thousands of tourists bring millions of dollars to Kenya.
- B. Wildlife is crucial to Kenya’s economic future, and the lion is a keystone species.
- C. Banning Furadan will save the lion, and ensure Kenya’s economic future.

Parliamentary Debate #3

This final assignment will bring together all that you have learned about argumentation and debate. The debate will be competition-style (it will follow the rules and format of intercollegiate debate competition). On the day of the debate, the teams who are scheduled to speak will flip for sides, with the winning team choosing which side they wish to argue. The government team will then be given a slip of paper with 3 resolutions on it—one fact or value, one policy, and one metaphor (see over). They will have one minute to strike the topic they do not wish to debate. The opposition team will then get the slip and strike one resolution and the resolution remaining will be the one that is debated. As in competition, the teams will have 15 minutes to prepare appropriate arguments on their side of the topic. They will not be allowed to consult electronic or prepared material or anyone but their partners in the preparation of the debate. Arguments will be supported by logic, examples, and analogies. You may cite sources (that's always a good thing), but they must be from memory.

Requirements

The requirements of the assignment depend upon the type of proposition. To recap, the two types of propositions we have learned and their requirements are:

- **Value:** Government team would define terms, give and justify a value, provide a criterion that supports the value, and give examples that flow through the criteria, and thereby the value. Opposition team would be prepared to argue the above, which may include arguing topicality or arguing to change the value, clash with the government's points, and give opposition examples that better uphold the value (either the one that the government provided or the one that they proposed) in the round.
- **Policy:** Government team would define terms, provide an appropriate policy criterion, articulate harms, give a plan with all required elements, show solvency/advantages. Opposition team would be prepared to argue the above, which may include arguing topicality, clash with the government's arguments, give disadvantages to the plan, and possibly offer a counterplan.
Either value or policy can be phrased as a metaphor:
- **Metaphor:** Government team would interpret the metaphor and provide a real-world value or policy case that fits the generally accepted meaning of the metaphor, providing the appropriate stock issues as detailed above. See over for further explanation.

You will lose significant points if you do not correctly identify the type of proposition and fulfill the required stock issues—you need to memorize this information.

Time limits for your final debate will be the same as in competition:

Prime Minister constructive	7 minutes
Leader of Opposition	8 minutes
Member of Government constrictive	8 minutes
Member of Opposition constructive	8 minutes
Leader of Opposition rebuttal	4 minutes
Prime Minister rebuttal	5 minutes

Analysis of metaphorical topics, with examples is on the next page.

Metaphorical Topics

Metaphorical resolutions are a lot of fun, in that you can decide, to a large extent, the topic of your debate. (This means that you can sometimes prepare cases in advance and spring them on the opposition.) There are limits to your discretion, however. You must keep with the spirit of the metaphor. For example, if you get “This house believes that there’s no use crying over spilt milk,” you must offer a case—either policy, fact, or value, either general or specific—where regret alone is a mistake. If you do not uphold the general sense of the metaphor, the opposition team can win by arguing that your interpretation is not topical and therefore unfair to the opposition.

The government team must offer a case that is a reasonable interpretation of the metaphor. Generally you do not define a metaphor word for word, but holistically (since defining the words in “out of the frying pan into the fire” does not tell us what it means). Depending on the exact wording of the resolution, it may be interpreted as a policy, a fact, or a value proposition.

Example Topics and Analysis

This house would push the envelope.

“Would” necessitates a policy; “push the envelope” demands that you go beyond that which has been tried before. You need to advocate a policy that goes further than we have in the past. You might legalize drugs, invade Iran, or send a manned mission to Mars. This topic allows broad latitude. With such an easy resolution you can pick a case that the opposition won’t expect.

This house believes it’s better to fight fire with fire.

This value resolution argues that it is better to respond in kind to aggression—that it is not a good idea to turn the other cheek. A case could be built comparing Jews during the Holocaust to the policy of Jews today in Israel, with the value of life. You could support of the death penalty with the value of justice. You could argue in favor of Bush’s war on terror, with the value of national security. When you have so many choices consider which case you think offers the least opposition arguments.

This US Federal government should change trains.

This policy proposition demands complete change of course. “Trains” could be almost anything. Abandoning the Electoral College would be good as would legalizing same-sex marriages. There are lots of choices here. The thing is, to be topical, the plan must be a complete change of current direction, not a just an increase, decrease or adjustment to a current policy.

Grease the squeaky wheel.

Because there is no “should” or “would,” you do not *have* to run this as a policy; but it would be easy to do so. This comes from the saying “the squeaky wheel gets the grease” meaning that those who are loud, even if they are in the minority, get what they want. You could legalize same-sex marriage, or give in to the demands of any vocal group.

This house believes that The Sun Will Come Up Tomorrow.

A fact proposition based on the song from *Annie* that demands you argue that the future holds hope. You could run a fairly general case saying that the Democrats will regain the Presidency and several aspects of life (healthcare, education, foreign policy) will improve. Or you could argue that the war in Iraq will eventually be successful and that US troops will come home and democracy will take hold in the Middle East.