Alan Cirlin, Ph.D.
St. Mary's University
Undergraduate Coordinator: Speech Communication St. Mary's University
B.A., U.C.L.A., 1974
M.A., California State University, Northridge,
Ph.D., University of Iowa

DEFENDING A CORE POSITION IN IPDA DEBATE

Abstract

Based on an analysis of actual IPDA debates, it seems obvious that too many debaters rely on straight refutation to win rounds. This seems to be especially true when debaters are on the negative. And often, when defending a position on either side, debaters allow their arguments to become scattered and diffused across a wide range of issues. While the strategies of straight refutation and a wide spread of arguments are often successful in non-IPDA debate, this paper argues that taking and defending a clear core belief system may be the best basic strategy for both the affirmative and negative in IPDA.[i]

Introduction

Debaters are always searching for an edge to help them achieve victory. This is the natural order of the universe and the way things ought to be. Of course, they are also developing life skills to build confidence, fluency, and persuasiveness. But to the competitor life skills are usually secondary to the goal of winning in the hear and now. Why else would NDT/CEDA debaters practice absurdly rapid delivery of techno-speak arguments.[ii] High speed-jargonistic delivery isn't being sought for its own sake. It's an artifact of the desire to win. And this is what usually wins in the U.S. on the 'traditional' debate circuits.

Debate coaches, on the other hand, should be searching primarily for ways to help their students develop confidence, fluency, and persuasiveness. For a coach, the development of life skills ought to be the essential goal and winning should be incidental. But from what I've observed, winning for its own sake has become the primary goal of too many debate educators. I've witnessed coaches actually drilling their debaters on speed delivery. This surely must be in the pursuit of victory rather than of pedagogy.

IPDA has provided a rhetorical alternative which permits both debaters and coaches to participate in a debate activity where the twin goals of victory and pedagogy are complimentary rather than antithetical. But at a recent tournament[iii] it struck me with great force how some strategies of IPDA debaters may de driven by the ghosts of our NDT/CEDA past. And while it is certainly true that many current debate practices which have derived from this heritage are quite valuable, it is also true that many others have been far more negative. This essay is an attempt to isolate what I believe to be one problematic manifestation from our murky roots and to suggest a cure.

The Roots of Refutation

Strategy is often driven by either the fear of refutation or by the desire to refute. On the affirmative side, the main force seems to be fear of refutation. This is illustrated by the question, "How do we design cases to protect ourselves from soon to be refuting negative opponents?" On the negative, the larger driving force seems to be the desire to refute. This is illustrated by the question, "What is the best way to attack affirmative cases in order to win debates?" Modern refutation theory was developed in a period when it was standard practice to debate policy resolutions. And the main theory which developed out of this period suggested that the negative had four main refutational strategies: Straight Refutation, Refutation with a Defense of the Present System, Refutation with Minor Repairs of the Present System, and Partial Refutation with a Counter-Plan

Straight Refutation. The most straightforward negative strategy is to simply disagree with everything the affirmative has said. In the simple version of this strategy, all the negative need do is to run down the affirmative case in order and dispute each claim in order. The main problem with the simple version, of course, is the danger of contradiction.[iv] Another problem is that your best arguments receive less attention (having to share time with your worst ones) and can get lost completely in the inevitable storm of objections. In a more sophisticated, and a much more effective, version of this strategy the negative thoughtfully selects a "platform" of issues to refute. Agreeing with some claims and disagreeing with others, negatives present the strongest refutation possible. But with both the simple and the more sophisticated variation, this strategy limits itself to refutational arguments.

Refutation with a Defense of the Present System. With this strategy negatives add a strong defense of the present system to a sophisticated refutation of the affirmative case. This strategy involves adding some additional issues to the negative platform of attacks - items that will involve defending the present system rather than merely attacking the affirmative case. Obviously, it is still important to be sure that all of the issues included in the negative platform are mutually supporting and non-contradictory. The arguments in support of the present system are generally presented as a semi-independent 'negative case.'

Refutation with Minor Repairs of the Present System. In some cases, it is politic to admit some flaws in the present system. The status quo isn't perfect. But the basic negative position is that we are better served in fixing the present system than in abandoning it for some unknown new system (the affirmative case). Hence, the platform of issues presented by the negative includes refutational items, carefully selected concessions of some affirmative claims, a limited defense of the present system as it is, some limited calls for 'minor repairs' to the present system, a strong defense of the repaired system, and a comparative analysis of how the repaired system would be far superior to the affirmative plan. The main advantage of this strategy is that it lets the negative avoid having to defend a badly flawed, indefensible status quo. The main weakness of this strategy is that it concedes some legitimacy to the affirmative case. And things can become confusing. But, since the affirmative has the burden of proof, confusion usually works to the advantage of the negative side. Thus, the tendency for a minor repairs strategy to create 'confusion' may often work to the advantage of the negative in traditional policy debates before traditional policy judges.

Partial Refutation with a Counter-Plan. There are times, of course, when the wisest course of action is to cut your losses and run. When the affirmative indictment of the present system is beyond obvious criticism and the present system is beyond reasonable defense, the best affirmative strategy may be to agree with the affirmative that 'something needs to be done.' In this case, the negative presents a carefully worded agreement that problems exist; then an even more carefully worded disagreement about the nature of that problem; and finally the a most carefully worded counter-plan (a non-topical alternative to the affirmative plan). This strategy allows negatives to avoid wasting time and losing credibility in banging their heads against irrefutable claims and to invest that time instead in presenting reasonable alternatives to affirmative cases. The negative gives up presumption but gains a major strategic advantage compared to any kind of defense of the present system.

It's easy to see how this system of thought developed from a policy perspective and how some of these strategies may only be somewhat applicable to resolutions of fact, value, or definition.

We must also note that these roots of refutation include the theory that the affirmative has the 'burden of proof' and the negative has 'presumption.' From this theoretical perspective, presenting a coherent case is a necessity for the affirmative to meet its burden of proof. But for the negative, defending a coherent case is just an option. According to the theory of presumption, if the affirmative cannot meet its burden of proof, the negative automatically wins. So while the affirmative side is almost forced to present and defend a coherent position, the negative has the option of coasting on straight refutation. Negatives, in traditional policy debate, can—and often do—employ all kinds of unreasonable and confusing strategies. They attack as much as possible and defend as little as possible, relying on the fact that a traditional, expert judge, when faced with chaos, is very likely to vote negative on presumption.

But the success of this "slash and burn" strategy depends on the presence of a "qualified" judge in the back of the room. And by "qualified" I mean, judges who are familiar with and can be counted on to abide by

the currently fashionable theories and common practices in the debate community. Lay judges are often unfamiliar with contemporary debate theories and practices and can be expected to lean heavily on common sense in deciding who won a debate. When faced with chaos, lay judges are more likely to vote for the side that presented and defended the most coherent and compelling core position.[v]

But in IPDA, the traditional burdens of the affirmative and negative debaters have been redefined somewhat. Item number 15 from an official IPDA "Instructions for Judges" handout[vi] states:

Decide who won the debate. Award the decision to whomever you think was the better debater and/or whomever had the best arguments. Decide quickly. The Affirmative has the burden of proof, but if you're not sure--Award the decision to the Best Speaker.[vii]

So what happens when NDT/CEDA refutational practices are used in non-policy debate and before lay IPDA judges?

A Psychological-Rhetorical Theory of Refutation

Many years ago, a friend of mine taught me to play bridge and brought me to a 'serious' contract bridge club. In serious bridge competition everyone plays a system and each player has a clear set of 'rules' concerning how the bidding and the play should proceed. If someone makes a mistake, that's a source of irritation but it's excusable. However, if someone intentionally breaks a rule, that's a cause for moral outrage. Not knowing any better, and given my poker background, I 'bluffed' in bidding a particularly bad hand. It turned into quite a learning experience for me. I'd never seen two sweet little old people go suddenly berserk like that before.

Sound like anyone we know? NDT/CEDA Debaters often become incensed when they make an argument in a debate round only to have it rejected by the judge. Debaters have been taught the rules and expect – no, make that DEMAND – that judges evaluate their rounds in terms of the rules they have been taught. So if negative debaters decide to 'spread' affirmatives, and thoroughly confuse the issues in the process, they expect to be rewarded by winning the ballot unless the affirmatives can keep up with them and unconfuse things. And when judges don't vote this way you can often hear strident voices of outraged debaters throwing berserker fits of their own.

But true lay IPDA judges, by definition, don't know any better. They don't know official debate rules and theories. And they often don't play by them even when they do. In my experience, lay judges apply a psychological-rhetorical set of standards to evaluate debates. This kind of mental processing is, I believe, very similar to the way lay jurors evaluate arguments presented in a trial or the way lay voters evaluative arguments presented during an election campaign.

Hence, the lay IPDA judge is likely to apply rule #15 above in a very natural and honest way. The rule isn't there so much to 'tell them how to vote.' It's there to tell them 'it's OK to vote your natural inclination.' From a practical, psychological-rhetorical perspective what does this mean? I can only guess. But based upon a great deal of feedback from lay, classroom judges over the years, I think the following is a fair description of the psychological-rhetorical criteria being used by the typical lay IPDA judge:

First: *Make a 'gut decision' about who won.* The reasons for a 'gut decision' may not be obvious, even to the judge, but it's clear from conversation this happens a lot. Gut decisions are rationalized after the fact, but only if necessary. If lay judges aren't pressed about why they made a decision, they typically give none and spend very little time thinking about it after the decision is made. If lay judges are pressed, or they have to make comments on a ballot, they will find reasons to justify their gut decision. But they do not make decisions based on theory and rules and are unlikely to apply official debate criteria even when made available to them.

Second: *If the gut isn't clear, vote for the debater whose position you most agreed with.* If there is no clear 'gut winner,' lay judges generally fall back on voting for the position they most agree with. Lay

judges find it very hard to vote against their personal convictions. In fact, I'm pretty sure that personal biases contribute mightily to many 'gut decisions.'

Third: ***If the issues aren't clear, vote for the debater you liked the most.*** When there is no gut winner and the judge has no particular bias concerning the resolution, lay judges fall back on voting for ethos.[viii] There are, of course, times when ethos rules. There are debates where the lay judge just happens to like one speaker far more than the other. Or conversely, debates where the lay judge dislikes one speaker far more than the other. In such cases, ethos may become the primary reason for the decision and other reasons will be rationalized to justify that decision. But from available evidence, ethos only becomes a major criterion for a lay judge's decision in extreme cases or when gut feelings and prior beliefs are fairly evenly matched.

Fourth: ***And if all else fails, vote for the debater who was 'the best speaker.'*** The 'Instructions for Judges' sheet states in its final sentence: "The Affirmative has the burden of proof, but if you're not sure--Award the decision to the Best Speaker." The bit about "burden of proof" was added first. It was primarily a sop to the more traditional debaters competing in IPDA and for new IPDA debaters who have received a strong education in traditional theory. They wanted lay judges to be 'told' about the burden of proof. But in actual practice, most classroom judges had a very a hazy idea what this technical directive really meant in the context of decision-making. They frequently asked how they were supposed to apply this rule. If they were told, "when you're not sure, vote for the negative," they would, of course, vote negative. But this smacked too much of traditional debate practice and seemed to encourage 'bad (rhetorical) behavior' by debaters when on the negative. So the bit about 'Award the decision to the Best Speaker' was added later. And it was deliberately put in the last sentence and with capitalization to suggest this as a final and ultimate criteria. This criterion was easily understood by even the least sophisticated judges. Lay judges in even the closest debates could, in the great majority of cases, identify a 'best speaker.' After being used in years of competition, this criteria resolved almost all ties and did so with great fairness and without encouraging NDT/CEDA type rhetorical practices.

Now if I'm right about the way lay judges generally apply these criteria, and I'm pretty sure I am, it's important for IPDA debaters to stop complaining about judges and to learn how to persuade them. And THAT will lead to the development of some real life skills. So what does this mean in actual IPDA rounds?

Practical Implications for IPDA Debaters

Earlier, I mentioned a recent debate round which sparked my thinking about this subject. The topic in that round was, "Resolved: the benefits of tourism outweigh the costs."[ix] The affirmative, of course, coasted on a relatively straightforward, unambiguous, and consistent defense of the international practice of tourism. The core position being defended was inherent in the resolution and extremely clear to everyone in the room.

The negative, on the other hand, did not seem to be defending anything. This might in part have been the result of the wording of the resolution. But wording aside, the negative made no obvious attempt to develop and present a core position. Instead the audience was treated to an example of the first refutational strategy discussed above (straight refutation). What came out was a long series of confusing attacks on tourism. These included such scattered issues such as health care, the environment, international law, trade policies, and terrorism.[x] And the impact of these attacks, when contrasted with the clear affirmative case, was in my opinion negligible.

What is a Core Position: It's important that we start the practical advice with a definition of 'core position.' This is for clarity and to avoid misunderstandings. But let's not make this any more complicated then it needs to be. If you can explain your fundamental belief about the world with respect to the resolution in a few short sentences so that an eight-year-old would understand it, then you have identified your 'core position.' If you can't do this, you don't have a core position to defend. It's really that simple.

Consider the tourism resolution above: The affirmative core position might be expressed in this way: "Tourism means people all around the world going on vacation to visit each other. There is a big business to help people do this. And this is good because it helps people learn about each other, it makes jobs for

people, and it does a lot of other nice things for the world." Now, I'm not suggesting you actually defend your affirmative case in these terms, unless of course your judge happens to be an eight-year-old. But you need to clearly understand what your core position is to be sure that all of your argumentation and examples are consistent with that position.

The negative in that debate did not have a core position. The negative merely had a long, confusing list of objections. But what might the negative speaker's core position have been? Perhaps something like this: "When people all around the world spend too much time going on vacation to visit each other lots of bad things happen. They waste a lot of money, they make a lot of mess, and they make it easy for bad guys to hurt good people. A little visiting is OK but right now there is too much and we need a lot of new rules to make it a good thing." As I said, this is not a strong position for the negative because this is not a good resolution for the negative. But at least this position is clear. And if you can out-debate your opponent, you may well win the lay judge's ballot. Without a core position to contrast with the affirmative case, the lay judge is unlikely to know whether you have out-debated your opponent or not.

Developing a core position is like forging a chain: A debater presenting a case is like a blacksmith forging a chain. You've only got a limited amount of time to forge your chain. You can use that time to forge a few big links or a lot of little links. And those links can clearly fit together (with a good core position) or they can fit badly and be disconnected. Which chain will support more weight?

The traditional rules of NDT/CEDA might reward the fragmented scattered chain because by the end of the debate everything seems chaotic. But the psychological-rhetorical criteria of lay judges make it likely they will compare the two chains, give each a tug, and prefer the one which at a gut level would seem to work best. So how does this knowledge help debaters and coaches in IPDA?

The practical advice I offer for defending a core position in IPDA is based on the criteria of lay judges presented above. And while the following advice is presented in terms of the four criteria, the debater may well be unaware of which the judge is actually likely to use in making the decision. Hence, my general advice would be, try to win on all four:

First Criterion: *When judges are making gut decisions about who won:* Topic selection comes first. The importance of topic selection is hardly a revelation for IPDA debaters, but thinking about core positions during topic selection might offer something very useful to consider during the striking process. Quite soon, you are going to want to defend a core position about the resolution. So look for a topic which allows you to do so – a topic that will allow you to develop a case which presents a strong, clear, and fairly simple chain of reasoning.

And remember that the other three criteria can clearly influence this one. If your position is extremely attractive or a complete anathema to the judge, if you come across as the good guy or the bad guy in the debate, and if you come across as a comparatively superior or inferior speaker to your opponent; these can all heavily influence the judge's gut decision. But also remember, you don't have to sacrifice defending a core position to achieve an advantage in any of these areas.

Second Criterion: *When judges are favoring positions closest to their prior beliefs:* This is an exercise in audience analysis at its practical best. The more you know about your particular judge or judges, the better you can adjust to their prior beliefs. Clearly, it makes a difference in topic selection and case design if your judge is a bleeding-heart liberal or an arch conservative. So the more useful information you can discover about your judge before you debate, the better your chances will be. But often times you can't. Or what you do discover isn't very helpful. What then?

Then you try to design your case as much as possible around universally accepted values. Death is bad. Jobs are good. Waste is bad. The environment is good. Theoretically, you can't develop your entire case with non-controversial claims. If you could the resolution wouldn't be debatable. However some cases are more extreme than others. If you happen to know your judge holds an extreme view, you can develop a case to match that view. Otherwise, I'd recommend trying to avoid extreme positions. In any case, be sure

whatever interpretation you develop – on the negative as well as on the affirmative – is presented so that your core position is clear and well defended.

All of this suggests that having a strong general knowledge base is very helpful to an IPDA debater. This is obviously true when designing an affirmative case. But a strong knowledge base is even more valuable when debating on the negative. The affirmative may throw you a curve and you'll need to adjust with almost no time to do so. Remember, judges are likely to have a fair amount of knowledge concerning their own beliefs. You don't want to sound like a fool to the judge because of your relative ignorance.

Third Criterion: *When judges are voting on ethos:* How can public speakers consistently project themselves as having high ethos? This is a common and well explored topic in almost any good public speaking textbook. Less commonly, it is included and developed in debate textbooks (which is something of an indictment of the 'state of the art' in traditional debate). Your goal is to present your case and yourself in such a way that the judge thinks you are a good person. As a comparative judgment in a debating situation, you want your audience to think you are a 'better' person than your opponent.

This is partly a matter of content and partly is a matter of style. And having a clear core position from which to present and defend your arguments may be your best hope of coming across as having high ethos. A major line of scholarship considers all human communication, especially persuasion, from a storytelling perspective.[xi] Hence, debate might be considered an exercise in comparative storytelling. Whose story is the audience going to like better and find more convincing? Part of this depends on the story itself and the way it's told; part depends on the qualities of the story teller.

Years ago I presented a paper in which I set out a list of ten criteria for persuasive storytelling.[xii] The first among these involved the ethos of the presenter. There were four sub-criteria which determined how credible the narrator/speaker was likely to appear to an audience: Access, Expertise, Virtue, and Attraction. Translating these into an IPDA debate context:

Access means making the judge believe that your evidence came from a reliable source and that you're not just 'making it up.'

Expertise means convincing the judge that you really understand what you are talking about.

Virtue means making the judge feel that you are trustworthy – that you are being honest and telling the truth as you know it.

Attraction is the quality of presenting yourself to the judge as being likable, friendly, supportive, interesting, and dynamic.

Fourth Criterion: *When judges are voting for the best speaker:* Here again there is a wealth of information in public speaking textbooks. There is also an unfortunate paucity of such information in debate textbooks.[xiii] But the other aspects of public speaking aside, if you are going to be an effective, persuasive speaker before a lay judge, you might want to keep a storytelling paradigm in mind. In this sense, one essential element of storytelling is having a clear core position to present and defend.

This criterion suggests that before lay judges one should avoid such traditional debate practices as spreading, using debate jargon, shouting all the time, avoiding eye contact with the audience (so you can maintain eye contact with your notes), and making overly harsh, negative statements about your opponents or their arguments.

There is, or should be, nothing terribly surprising about the practical advice being offered in this paper. Select a topic you can 'sell' to your judge; develop a strong core position relative to that topic; be as knowledgeable as you can on a variety of subjects; use your core position to organize your materials and arguments; try to be 'the good person speaking well;' and work to develop a high quality, persuasive delivery. It should be the goal of every debater and every debate coach to emphasize these practical skills.

These are the life skills for building confidence, fluency, and persuasiveness with which we opened this discussion.

Broader Implications

If the basic argument being advance in this essay is true, that developing and defending a 'core position' is generally the most effective strategy for both affirmative and negative speakers before lay judges - and I strongly believe this argument is true – then it may have important implications for such diverse rhetorical venues as political elections, courtroom trials, advertising campaigns, classroom teaching, and any number of other persuasive/advocacy contexts.

Political candidates should do better with voters if they project a limited number of clear core positions rather than a large number of detailed policies. Consider the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections by way of example. I would call the reader's attention to the 2008 primary election debates as well.

Courtroom lawyers should do better with juries if they defend a clear core position rather than scattering their arguments over a broad range of issues. Contrast the O.J. Simpson criminal and civil trials by way of example.

Advertising campaigns should be more successful with consumers if they develop and consistently project a limited core position with respect to their product. This is such a well known principle on Madison Avenue that almost any good ad campaign will serve as an example.[xiv]

And in my opinion, classroom teachers will generally do better with students if they enter each course and each class session with a clear core position concerning what they are trying to teach, why students should be interested in learning it, and how the students are likely to apply that learning in the future.

Good luck; happy debating; and have an even happier personal and professional life.

Endnotes:

[1] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the International Public Debate Association National Convention in Monticello, Arkansas, April 2005. Hence, much of the language in this essay reflects the state of IPDA debate at that time. I considered trying to revise this manuscript to make that reflection of the current state of IPDA Debate more accurate, but I quickly realized that I am no longer in close enough contact with actual IPDA debate rounds to do so. However, I felt that this particular form of obsolescence would not diminish the value of the content of this analysis, so I simply left the language alone.

[ii] From what I hear, NPDA is well on the way to heading down this same road. This is a trend I predicted some years ago as being almost inevitable. "A Sociological Approach to Improving Style in Academic Debate," *Southern Journal of Forensics*, 1997, 3, 170-201.

[iii] The Pineywoods Showdown, Stephen F. Austin University, Nacogdoches, Texas, March 5-6, 2005.

[iv] There is a wonderfully succinct illustrative example of the contradictory problems of straight refutation which I like to use. It is based on a traditional Jewish joke: A woman demands a pot from her neighbor. The woman claims 'her neighbor borrowed the pot, it was a new pot, and it was never returned.' The neighbor replies, "I never borrowed the pot, it was an old pot, and I returned it in better condition than when I got it."

[v] This judging tendency has been known to drive NDT/CEDA debaters wild when debating IPDA for the first time. Their gut reaction is that THEY are right and IPDA is wrong. Hence, it is quite common to hear these NDT/CEDA transfers, and their coaches, calling for major reforms of IPDA – more specifically, the extensive training and qualifying of IDPA judges. But, of course, if IPDA ever gives in to this pressure and starts down that road, it might as well simply vote itself out of existence. Then the IPDA students and

coaches can go back to doing traditional debate or NPDA. And it won't matter whether they actually join another association or continue as IPDA. With trained, expert judges in IPDA, you will eventually (15 years at the most, based on the CEDA and NPDA experiments) find that the style of IPDA debate has morphed back into the NDT/CEDA style – i.e., speed, jargon, abusiveness, faddish trends, canned cases, and highly non-rhetorical styles of delivery. And, by the way, the really good news is that AFTER traditional NDT/CEDA debaters and their coaches have gotten used to the new way of doing things, they often fall in love with IPDA and lose their desire to reform it. I have always taken this to mean that we are doing some things very right and that we are sponsoring a very valuable educational activity.

[vi] That is to say, this was the primary (but not exclusive) IPDA "Instructions for Judges" handout in use when I finished my work as Executive Secretary in 2002.

[vii] This was from the 2003 version of the handout – the last year I was an executive officer in IPDA.

[viii] Ethos, of course, is one of Aristotle's three main criteria for a persuasive speaker. Quintillian defines this as "the good man (person) speaking well." For our purposes we can consider ethos to be the quality of being a knowledgeable, honest, trustworthy, likable, and skilled speaker.

[ix] The astute reader will note that this is a badly worded resolution. Why? It puts the 'burden of proof' on the negative. I.e., tourism is de facto a major industry all around the world. It fuels travel, it creates jobs, it stimulates local economies. Many people depend on it for their livelihoods. Hence, the status quo already assumes the benefits outweigh the costs. This wording of the resolution allows the affirmative to coast on a very strong presumption and forces the negative to assume the burden of proof. That's a tough challenge when the affirmative ALSO gets to present the initial case, define terms, and speak last. A well worded resolution would have been, "Resolved: the costs of tourism outweigh the benefits." Tournament hosts and event directors are well advised to review the IPDA topics to double check that the burden of proof is fairly placed in the resolutions. It can, of course, be argued that it's up to debaters to select the topic they are going to debate. True. But when there are only five choices and two strikes it doesn't give you a lot of room to maneuver, especially when one or more of the topics is badly biased against you.

[x] The final vote in this round was 2-1 in favor of the affirmative. And I'm fairly sure that if I could have read the ballot, or better yet the mind, of the judge who voted negative I would have found the criteria used in making this decision were traditional NDT/CEDA criteria.

[xi] Walter R. Fisher, "Narration as Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument," Communication Monographs, Vol. 51, 1984, pp. 1-22.

[xii] Alan Cirlin, "Narration, Persuasion, and Social/Cognitive Reality," a paper presented at the National Convention of the Communication Association of Japan, Yatsushiro, Japan, 1986.

[xiii] Most NDT/CEDA and even NPDA debate textbooks make little or no mention of delivery. And when they do, the things they have to say usually bear almost no relationship to what takes place in NDT/CEDA/NPDA debate rounds. Their advice is applicable to IPDA however and does bear some relationship to real world advocacy. However, if you simply must have a debate text discussion of effective delivery, I would modestly recommend Alan Cirlin, *An Introductory Handbook on the Theory and Practice of Debate*, 2nd. Ed., Pecan Grove Press: San Antonio, Texas 1989. It's not easy to find anymore so check with me if you need a copy. And beware of the CEDA emphasis in the text. It was written several years before NPDA and almost a decade before IPDA were launched as debate associations. At that time CEDA was, in most places, the 'only game in town' worth playing.

[xiv] I rather suspect that the severe time/space limits of advertising almost force practitioners into following a core position strategy. Television and Radio ads may be only seconds long. Print advertising is typically less than a page in length. Without a clear and limited message, how else are you to get your message across?