

# Toastmasters International Debate Organizer (Summarized)

## General Information

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Date/Format:</b>
<b>Resolved:</b>	
<b>Judge 1:</b>	<b>Judge 3:</b>
<b>Judge 2:</b>	<b>Judge 4(?):</b>
<b>Affirmative Speaker 1:</b>	<b>Negative Speaker 1:</b>
<b>Affirmative Speaker 2:</b>	<b>Negative Speaker 2:</b>

## Checklist

Location, date & time set?	Topic chosen?
Debate structure chosen and reviewed?	Ballot counters required and/or assigned?
Participants identified?	Judges selected?
Participants briefed?	Judges briefed?
Certificates, ribbons, prizes, etc. collected?	Judge gifts required and collected?

## Debates Information for the Organizer

Introduction	<p>Formal debates are dynamic and informative. They also offer Toastmasters the opportunity to make a significant contribution to their community. Starting with intra-club debates, the program can then expand to include inter-club, area, and district meets. As debaters become more polished, they can then invite outside groups. By selecting a topic of importance to the community, participants and the audience have the chance to learn about the subject and form an intelligent opinion.</p> <p>When you plan to stage a debate of this nature, work an announcement of the topic, participants, time, and place. Send it to the various news media in your community. Be sure also to contact the officials of other organizations, church groups, and schools, inviting their members or students to the debate. Provide them a copy of the announcement so they can pass it around or post it to a board.</p> <p>These instructions provide some basic principles (summarized from Toastmasters' handbook).</p>
How You Can Benefit	<p>Formal debates are amazing opportunities for Toastmasters to develop 3 basic abilities: better listening, thinking, and speaking (not only for participants, but for spectators as well). Participation develops your ability to make a quick response, present coherent arguments, and make a clear presentation of your views. Nowhere else can a Toastmaster find a more ideal method for learning competitive speaking in a "head-on" situation.</p>
What Is A Debate?	<p>A debate is a speaking event in which 2 sides use reasoned discourse to argue about a subject. The immediate goal of each team is to convince a panel of judges/the audience that its arguments are better than those of the opposition. The emphasis is on logic, but emotional appeals and logical arguments that carry emotional weight may be used. However, debate generally is characterized by emphasis on logical, not emotional, appeal.</p>
Organizing The Debate	<p>Any debate must begin with the proposition (subject) to be debated. It should be a declarative sentence which advocates change from the status quo. It will generally be one of three types: will deal with a question of policy, fact, or belief. A good topic will likely be based on policy rather than fact or belief because a factual proposition leaves too little room for argument, while a proposition based on belief/opinion often permits too much room for argument.</p> <p>A debate proposition is normally stated in a formal style: "Resolved: That _____ should _____." The word 'should' is used to convey the meaning 'ought to' and does not imply the proposition will come to pass. To provide more interest in the debate for participants &amp; audience, the proposition should deal with a topic of immediate general interest.</p> <p>One of the reasons for stating the proposition this way is to provide speakers the opportunity to take sides. Speakers will take the affirmative side (support), while other speakers will take the negative side (oppose). Each team is then identified merely as 'affirmative' or 'negative'.</p> <p>Before starting the debate, all participants should agree upon the wordings, making sure it's clear and fairly stated.</p>
Debate Formats	<p>All debates consist of constructive and rebuttal speeches by each side. Each debate begins with the first affirmative speaker presenting the proposition and defining unclear or controversial terms contained in its wording. Any disagreement on wording should be brought out by the first negative speaker. Thereafter, various formats may be used; but since not all of them will be of general interest to Toastmasters, only more common types are here.</p> <p>A special type of debate was devised for Toastmasters International. It works well in club programs because it includes prepared speeches and a cross-examination period and still only takes about 35 minutes.</p>

## Debate Format: Traditional Debate (Four Speakers)

SECTION	TIMING	SPEAKER ORDER
1. Constructive Speeches	10 minutes per speech	Affirmative #1, Negative #1, Affirmative #2, Negative #2
2. Rebuttal Speeches	5 minutes per speech	Affirmative #1, Negative #1, Affirmative #2, Negative #2

## Debate Format: Special TI Debate (Four Speakers)

SECTION	TIMING	SPEAKER ORDER
1. Constructive Speeches	5 minutes per speech	Affirmative #1, Negative #1, Affirmative #2, Negative #2
2. Cross-examination & Refutation	3 minutes per speech	Negative #1 cross-examines Affirmative Case Affirmative #1 cross-examines Negative Case Negative #2 refutes and summarizes Affirmative #2 refutes and summarizes

## Debates Information for Contestants

Presumption and Burden of Proof	The presumption in debate is that the status quo is satisfactory until proven otherwise. The burden of proof is therefore upon the affirmative. They must prove that present conditions are such that a change from status quo is desirable.
Issues	<p>Issues in debate are important questions that will be answered 'yes' by the affirmative and 'no' by the negative. These issues are crucial points which must be substantiated by evidence. The affirmative must find all the issues inherent in the wording of the proposition and be prepared to answer three stock issues. Most debate textbooks suggest these are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a need/desire for a change? 2. Is there a plan by which the need can be satisfied?</li> <li>3. Would the benefits of the plan outweigh the disadvantages?</li> </ol> <p>Issues for the negative would be the opposite of these:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The present system is satisfactory or improving. 2. The proposed plan would be disadvantageous.</li> <li>3. The proposed change will not be a practical solution to the problem.</li> </ol> <p>It's advisable when planning a debate for a TM program to limit the number of issues inherent in the wording of the proposition. Otherwise the debate will be too long and complicated.</p>
Preparation for the Debate	<p>Debaters should analyze the proposition and arguments for and against its adoption, as well as what seems to have created the problem indicated by the wording of the proposition. The wording of the proposition then should be studied to see that there is no inherent advantage for on team or the other.</p> <p>It's generally also a good idea to study the background of the question to understand the situation from which the proposition emerged. Following this, collect all arguments and evidence that relate to the proposition.</p> <p>Your next step should be to narrow the question and put aside extraneous material. At this point it is helpful if you can mutually agree with the opposition about exclusion of material. Eg. It may be agreed that constitutionality of a proposition should be regarded as irrelevant since the constitution has been amended many times and can be amended again.</p> <p>You should gather as much evidence as possible, keeping track of your sources. Many debaters find it useful to organize evidence on cards and keep them in a box in front of them.</p> <p>Arrive early at the debate location and see where the timer is located. Establish what the signals mean. The affirmative does not need to state it has the burden of proof, nor the presumption, but both teams/judges should understand these concepts in order to understand the responsibilities of the debaters. Similarly, the affirmative team need not use the term 'issues' nor state the issues in the debate, but speakers must come to understand the issues beforehand so they can come to grips with them during the debate.</p>
Contentions	<p>Contentions are statements which come directly or indirectly from the analysis of the proposition and the arguments and are used to support the issues. However, they are not proof, nor are they to be regarded as an issue in the debate. The affirmative contentions usually will be that there is a demand for an immediate change from the status quo and that this change can be brought about in such a way that it would not only solve the problem but have a further advantage.</p> <p>In developing contentions, the affirmative usually points out how their plan is capable of practical administration. The negative contentions parallel these, opposing them at every point. Eg. The negative would contend that the present system is operating satisfactorily and that necessary adjustments are already being made for any evils pointed out by the affirmative. The negative would also contend that the dangers/evils implicit in the proposed change would outweigh advantages. The negative would then challenge the administration of the plan and its enactment, pointing out there are certain evils here too.</p>
Building Your Case	<p>Each team must build its case in a logical manner. Ie. Building a case is the formal, methodical presentation of your team's arguments. Normally a case is built on 3-5 major contentions, each backed with evidence to support the issues of the debate. There is no substitution for research. Each contention used to build the case should be supported with valid evidence gathered from research. No contention will be allowed to stand if it isn't backed with evidence, and evidenced contentions made by the opposition.</p> <p>There are several types of cases that can be used (see next page).</p>

## Cases for the Affirmative

Stock Issue Case	<p>The affirmative uses the stock issues to support its position. Using this method, the affirmative must: 1) establish that existing conditions demand a change from the status quo; 2) identify a plan which will provide the change; 3) show that the proposed change will be better than the status quo. The case is won by isolating the issues inherent in the proposition and by presenting logical, valid evidence which supports these issues. (The negative stock issue case would be built by proving the opposite.)</p> <p>The concept may be illustrated by comparing it with a legal situation. Burglary in one state, for example, is defined as "breaking and entering a building with the <i>intent</i> to commit a <i>felony</i> or <i>misdemeanor</i> therein." All the italicized words constitute issues, and the prosecuting attorney (affirmative) would have to support each of them to win the case (debate). If the prosecutor proved that the defendant broke into and entered the building but failed to prove intent, the defendant might be guilty of a lesser crime but not burglary. (The affirmative did not substantiate all the issues).</p>
Chain of Reasoning Case	A refinement of the stock issue case. It employs a series of syllogisms related logically to one another. Therefore, if one of the series is accepted, it is reasonable to accept the others.
Topical Case	The affirmative introduces two or more contentions by using the methods employed in a stock issue case, then unites these contentions in the proposed change.
Disjunctive Case	The affirmative presents two contentions that are not related. If either contention stands in the debate, the affirmative has then supported the proposition. This technique forces the negative to deal with both contentions.
Residue Case	Based on the idea that the reason for accepting the proposition is the failure of other solutions. The affirmative usually discussed various attempts that have been made to correct the problem and points out that none have succeeded. They then advance their own proposal and suggest it will succeed.

## Types of Cases for the Negative

Dynamic Status Quo Case	<p>In essence, an 'adjustment and repairs' case built upon the idea that the status quo is rapidly changing and that necessary adjustments are already being made. The negative usually points out the affirmative has exaggerated the evils in the present system. Then, after minimizing evils, point out that necessary adjustments are being made. If the negative can refute the evils pointed out by the affirmative and establish that adjustments are being made, they have weakened the affirmative's "need" issue.</p> <p>This type of case usually involved pointing out new evils which would emerge from the "radical change" proposed by the affirmative, as well as that the affirmative plan would be impossible o administrate and would not really meet the needs as established in the first part of the negative's arguments against the affirmative's case.</p>
Counter Plan Case	<p>The negative generally will admit some part of the need as presented by the affirmative, then suggests an alternate proposal that is different from the affirmative's and will solve the problems mentioned by the affirmative in their analysis of the proposition. The negative will cite advantages of their own plan, minimizing and discounting the plan of the affirmative. Remember, in a case of this nature the negative assumes the burden of proof that the counter plan will not only meet the need but will be a better solution than the affirmative's proposal. In essence, the negative, by advocating a counter plan, has taken over part of the role normally assumed by the affirmative. Thus it is essential that their plan be significantly different from the plan of the affirmative.</p> <p>A matter of ethics is involved in presenting a counter plan, and the negative should not wait until the second negative constructive speech to introduce it. Rather, the first negative speaker should explain that a counter plan is being used, and the speaker should develop the counter plan as completely as possible in the speech.</p>
Even If Case	The negative refutes the need for a change and then proceeds to show that 'even if' the status quo were unsatisfactory, the affirmative proposition would not be advantageous or practical. Basic to the "even if" case is the contention that there is no need to abandon the status quo, and even if conditions were as bad as the affirmative contends, the affirmative proposal would result in even greater evils.
Direct Refutation	Every argument advanced by the affirmative is dealt with, countered and defeated by the negative. Within this category are several types of cases. The first is the 'shotgun' approach in which the negative merely attacks each and every premise the affirmative presents. This is one of the weakest methods of building the negative case. A better method is to summarize the affirmative's arguments into some key contentions and clearly state the <i>prima facie</i> case. The negative then attacks the major points, using a rifle instead of a shotgun.

## Speaker Responsibilities: Constructive Speeches

Affirmative #1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Give the introduction. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. State the resolution.</li> <li>b. Show the purpose and importance of the debate.</li> <li>c. Give a brief history.</li> <li>d. Define the terms of the resolution.</li> <li>e. State the general terms.</li> <li>f. Summarize the affirmative position.</li> <li>g. Explain the procedure (what you will cover; what your partner will cover).</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. State the body (proof) of the case. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Cover the need issue (or first main argument).</li> <li>b. Support the first issue with examples, facts, etc. always giving sources.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
----------------	---

Negative #1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. After greeting audience, accept or reject definition of terms as presented by affirmative 1.</li> <li>2. Fill in any necessary information missing from the affirmative 1's introduction of the debate question (history, analysis of the problem, etc.).</li> <li>3. Give general refutation of the points covered by affirmative 1.</li> <li>4. Summarize the negative position (what you will cover, what your partner will cover).</li> <li>5. Present your part of the negative argument. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Cover your "no need" argument, or your first issue.</li> <li>b. Provide evidence and proof for your contentions.</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. Summarize your points and refer again to what your partner will cover.</li> </ol>
Affirmative #2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Give brief refutation of the negative 1's charges or questions.</li> <li>2. Refer again to the plan you are adopting by reiterating the need issue covered by your partner.</li> <li>3. Give your portion of the body of your case. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Cover the practicability issue (or second issue).</li> <li>b. Provide evidence (proof) for your arguments.</li> <li>c. Cover the benefit issue (or third major argument).</li> <li>d. Provide evidence to support the third issue.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Summarize your arguments.</li> <li>5. Provide the close of the affirmative case by restating your position and appealing to the audience for acceptance.</li> </ol>
Negative #2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Give refutation of affirmative 2's charges or questions.</li> <li>2. Give further reference and support for your partner's points in your overall plan.</li> <li>3. Give your portion of the body of the negative argument. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Cover the "not practicable" issue, or second main issue.</li> <li>b. Provide supporting evidence of your arguments.</li> <li>c. Cover the "no benefit" issue, or your third main argument.</li> <li>d. Provide supporting evidence of third argument.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Summarize your main points.</li> <li>5. In closing the negative presentation, restate your position and try to secure audience acceptance.</li> </ol>

### Speaker Responsibilities: Refutation and Rebuttal Period

After the constructive speeches is a period of cross-examination, or refutation and rebuttal. (Refutation is an attack upon what has been said by the opposition, while rebuttal is reinforcement of what has been advanced by your own team). There is usually very little time between the last constructive speech of the negative and the first rebuttal speech. The negative team, however, should have some opportunity to confer before the rebuttal speeches begin so they may decide which line of action to take in the refutation period.

Negative #1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Summarize what your partner has said, and amplify those parts you think necessary.</li> <li>2. Concentrate on impracticality of affirmative plan and point out new evils emerging from adoption of their plan.</li> <li>3. Discount any advantages cited by affirmative for their plan.</li> <li>4. Attempt primarily to prove there is no need for change from status quo.</li> <li>5. End with short summary.</li> </ol>
Affirmative #1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Summarize high points of the debate so far, presenting the affirmative case in terms of what has been established and the negative arguments in terms of what the affirmative has said about it.</li> <li>2. Counter all the opposition's arguments directly, pointing out weakness in logical structure.</li> <li>3. Restate all the contentions of the affirmative team.</li> <li>4. End with a short summary.</li> </ol>
Negative #2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Summarize debate to that point, emphasizing critical issues still under consideration.</li> <li>2. Refute what the affirmative has established, especially the <i>prima facie</i> point.</li> <li>3. Avoid calling for more information, because it can be readily supplied by affirmative #2 and not refuted.</li> <li>4. Review all major objections the negative has to the affirmative proposal.</li> <li>5. Close with direct appeal to audience to concur with the negative.</li> </ol>
Affirmative #2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analyze entire debate and boil down to the critical issues.</li> <li>2. Fairness requires that no new or uncalled-for material can be introduced.</li> <li>3. Refute arguments advanced by the negative.</li> <li>4. Provide rebuttal material to strengthen your team's case.</li> <li>5. Tie all major points together and point out what affirmative has accomplished.</li> <li>6. Restate how need has been established and how recommended plan meets that need.</li> <li>7. Close asking for concurrence with affirmative position.</li> </ol>

## Debates Information for Judges

One of the more important aspects of staging a debate is having it properly judged. It's important the judges understand the principles of debating and judging and the responsibilities of the teams. Your club's VPE should meet with the individuals who will be judging well in advance of the meet. They should review the principles of judging in this booklet, making sure they are understood clearly. It will also be helpful to refer to some of the texts in the Suggested Reading page below.

Judging a Debate	<p>Debate decisions are based on which team does better debating. The judge should not permit his own convictions on the topic to influence the decision. Remember the debaters are debating each other, not the judge.</p> <p>The judge should attempt to determine which team established the greater probability for its position. Normally, the debate revolves around the significance of the problem and its causes; the relative desirability and practicability of the proposed solution as opposed to the status quo; or some other alternative solution proposed by the negative.</p>
Other Considerations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The affirmative must show that a problem exists, explain its nature, and indicate its causes. They must show how their solution will better meet the problem than it is currently being met, or than it would be met by an alternative solution proposed by the negative.</li> <li>2. The negative must show that the present solution is more advantageous than the affirmative solution. They may also argue that no problem exists.</li> <li>3. The probability of one side or the other is established because the quantity and quality of the evidence and soundness of the reasoning indicates that one solution is more likely to be advantageous than the other.</li> <li>4. In academic debate, the affirmative has the responsibility to establish the probability that its proposal will solve the problem. Should the negative choose to defend a counter plan, the negative assumes the responsibilities for proving that its proposal will better solve the problem than the affirmative proposal.</li> </ol>
Judging Factors	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If either side presents a long series of relatively unsupported arguments, the only obligation of the opposition is to point out that the arguments have not been supported and to insist that the side advancing such arguments develop them before they are worthy of refutation.</li> <li>2. An argument is presumed won by a side if it is not challenged by the opposition, no matter how poorly the argument may have been developed.</li> <li>3. The case for or against the proposition must be presented and developed in the constructive speeches. It is the purpose of the rebuttal to answer arguments already developed, not build new ones.</li> <li>4. Although the judge should let the debaters answer each others' arguments, he should remember that in the last affirmative rebuttal there is no possibility of refutation by the negative. The judge should, therefore, be wary of last-minute attempts by the affirmative to answer negative arguments that the team has not previously attempted to refute.</li> <li>5. Both teams should be debating the same thing. I.e. They should agree on definition of terms. The affirmative has a right to initiate any fair definition. If the negative feels the affirmative definitions are unfair, they must present their own definitions and justify them. If the negative fails to object to the definitions, the definitions stand.</li> <li>6. In no case should a judge stop the debate until the expiration of all speeches.</li> <li>7. In no case should a judge give a consolation or sympathy vote to the weaker team, or award a tie vote.</li> <li>8. Although the principles previously stated are primary, the judge should penalize, depending upon the severity of the practice, such things as discourtesy toward opponents, distortion of opponents' remarks, obvious fabrication of evidence, etc.</li> <li>9. When there is a checklist on the ballot, the judge should remember it is provided as an aid to the debater; the judge should not assume that the items listed have equal value.</li> <li>10. Delivery by itself should not be a major factor in determining the decision. However, delivery will influence the clarity and credibility of the ideas.</li> </ol>
Final Remarks	<p>Judges should be supplied with a debate ballot to help them with their decision. Sample ballots are available from Toastmasters International you can use to develop a ballot for your debate programs.</p> <p>A formal debate will be an interesting variation from your regular club programming. It provides an entertaining way for Toastmasters to improve their speaking, listening, and thinking. To learn the finer points of debate presentation and judging, we suggest you consult one or more of the books in the Suggested Reading section.</p>

## Suggested Reading

Argumentation, Discussion and Debate (Craig A. Baird)	Influencing Through Argument (Robert B. Huber)
Contest Speaking Manual (Wm. Buys, Cobin, Hunsinger, Miller & Scott)	Forensic Tournament management (Paul Hunsinger, Roy Wood)
Discussion and Debate (Wm. Buys, Jack Murphy and Bruce Kendall)	Argumentation and Debate (James H. McBath)
Principles of Argumentation and Debate (Glen R. Capp, Thelma R. Capp)	Argumentation and Debate (James H. McBurney)
Argumentation and Debate (Lionel Crocker)	The Dynamics of Debate (Eugene Moulton)
Argumentation and Debate (Austin J. Freeley)	Competitive Debate (George Musgrave)
Essentials of Discussion and Debate (Hulbert Gulley)	A Handbook for Beginning Debaters (David W. Shepard, Paul Cashman)
How to Judge Speech Contests (J. N. Holm)	