

JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC DEBATE ASSOCIATION



APRIL 2009, VOLUME 3, ISSUE 1

Editor
Patrick G Richey
IPDA Governing Board
University of Southern Mississippi

Peer Reviewers:

Bob Alexander: *Bossier Parish Community College*
Web Drake: *Mississippi College*
Jeffery Hobbs: *University of Texas at Tyler & Phuket Rajabhat University*
Shane Puckett: *Louisiana Tech University*

Journal of the International Public Debate Association

Volume 3

Issue 1

April 2009

Editorial:

Debate Should Be Two Things.
Adam Matthew Key

Articles:

Technology in IPDA:

Teleconferencing & IPDA: Case study, requirements, budget, and instructions for effective teleconferencing debate.

Chad Freeman, Emily Hill, Robert Steinmiller, & Ivey Kelley

TELE-DEBATE: The Future of Forensics?

Alan Cirlin

General Research:

Participation and Success Rates for Women and Minorities in IPDA Debate.

Bob Alexander, Joe Ganakos, & Trey Gibson

Peter Ramus: Significance in Rhetoric and Attacks on Cicero.

Cole Franklin

Resolution of Risk.

Robert "Rob" Redding Jr.

Preparing Students for Future Careers.

Jean Eldred

Meta-Debate: A necessity for any debate style.

Nicholas Ducote & Shane Puckett

Counterplans as Opportunity Cost: A view of counterplan function in academic debate.

Caitlin Hodge & Shane Puckett

I would like to take a few sentences to thank everyone who helped this year with the IPDA journal. Thank you for the hard work and kind suggestions. I hope this year's addition is a vast improvement from last years in both breath and depth. I do grant again that this is far from flawless or perfect but with your help, it is getting better. I finally want to thank my wife, Becky, for supporting all my wild forensic adventures.

Editorial:**Debate should be two things**

Adam Matthew Key

Assistant Instructor of Communication Studies, Sam Houston State University

Director of Forensics

M.I.S. (ABT) Stephen F. Austin State University

Steve Goode, former IPDA National Champion and good friend to many on the circuit from years past, used to open each and every debate by saying “Debate is both fun and educational. When it stops being either of those things, we should stop doing it.” It has been many years since Steve and I were teammates at Stephen F Austin State University. As I returned to IPDA as a coach, I found it a very different circuit than the IPDA I left, which gave me pause to wonder if we were still fulfilling Steve’s maxim.

While I make no claims of perfection concerning earlier years of IPDA, I do believe the circuit at that time yielded rhetorical contests that were both educational and fun. In the past five years, however, several trends which draw away from both those foundations have crept into the organization. Namely, calls of abuse, weighing mechanisms, and the use of the Internet.

Abuse:

This past season yielded several firsts for me. This was my first time as head coach of a debate team. I hosted my first IPDA tournament. And, for the first time in over a decade of forensic competition, I had abuse called on me during a round. This was truly a shocking experience. In the IPDA I remembered, abuse was the dirtiest of words. It was saved only for those people dastardly enough to redefine a resolution in such a way that if you interviewed a thousand people and asked them what a particular resolution meant, not a single one would come close to how the affirmative took it. It was a shameful thing to be called abusive. You feared your coach, your teammates, and the rest of the circuit would hear about it. Contrast that with the modern day, where the negative cries abuse on a regular basis. It’s no longer a big deal. Instead, it is simply taken as part of the game. Abuse is often cried, not for the intended purpose of calling foul on a debate travesty, but because the Negative simply would have preferred if the Affirmative had taken a resolution differently. Abuse no longer means the take on the resolution is illegitimate, just that the Negative doesn’t like it. This harms debate for a few reasons.

Primarily, it harms the education of the debate round. At the point where abuse is called, the round no longer becomes about the resolution. No real arguments are hatched, nor clash presented against the affirmative case. Instead, the substance of the round centers around the character of the Affirmative. The Negative doesn’t win an abuse claim by debating the round, but by proving that the Affirmative is a sleazy lowlife who’s trying to take advantage of everyone in the room. The attacks are no longer academic but ad hominem. And the Affirmative is left, not to defend against attacks on his case, but on his person.

No one shakes hands after a round where abuse is called. How could they? As opposed to the gamesmanship and mutual respect that comes from a hotly debated contest, both competitors look on each other with disdain. As opposed to looking across the classroom at a worthy opponent that you would not mind losing to, you now look at

an enemy. No matter which name is circled on the ballot, someone will feel cheated. Truthfully, everyone in the room should feel that way. The true victim isn't the Affirmative or the Negative, but the resolution itself. All the potential for lively academic discourse imbued within its words have been stolen. In the types of rounds calls of abuse were designed for, there would be no education anyway. In most cases, though, abuse claims destroy the potential for education within a round.

In addition to the lack of education, repeated calls of abuse decrease the overall severity of the accusation. Like the proverbial boy who cried wolf, the claims often fall on deaf ears. If the judges are experienced (another issue entirely), they've doubtlessly heard it many times before. Most competitors are used to having abuse called on them, and coaches have accepted the claims to be both spurious and the norm. Since the charges of abuse are so rampant and typically without weight, no one looks down on those accused of it. Indeed, some may even feel sympathy for the Affirmative for many of the reasons previously mentioned. This situation seems all well and good until the day the wolf actually shows up.

Imagine, if you will, the day that you are the Negative in a preliminary round. You've spent your half hour well and are loaded to the gills with refutation for what seems to everyone to be a very straightforward resolution. Up steps the affirmative, and to your horror he interprets the resolution in a way no person could possibly fathom. His refined arguments and use of a plethora of citations tell you that this is a canned case, one written days or even weeks beforehand. And worse yet, since the Affirmative's take on the resolution is so far afield from the actual wording, you've been robbed of your prep time. Even if the case isn't canned, the Affirmative has had thirty minutes to prepare and you've had zero. What do you do in this situation? What can you do? The wolf has finally shown up, but since it's been called so many times, no one cares to listen to you as your chance to win is devoured.

Finally, there is a distinct harm beyond the one to education and to the debater who cried wolf. Let's say you accept what I've said here and decide to treat abuse as the serious charge it's supposed to be. The experience is something like being the only car to not change lanes in slow moving traffic. The reason most traffic jams move so slow is that cars keep changing lanes. As one car moves to the lane to its left or right, it causes all the cars behind it to put on their brakes. At the same time, it frees up a car length in its previous lane. As cars start moving to fill in the gap, other cars see that lane moving and try to change lanes into it. You can see the obvious problem here. Traffic would move a lot quicker if people would stop changing lanes, stop trying to better their own position at the expense of their fellow man. However, if everyone is changing lanes and you're not, they're all going to advance while you're stuck. In essence, you are punished for trying to do the right thing.

Unfortunately, the same is true of debaters. So long as calling abuse is the norm, rather than the exception, debaters who refuse to call abuse will be punished for doing the right thing. How is that, you may ask? The answer is simple: If you don't call abuse, you can lose the round. I once saw an outround that, in my opinion, was one of the most one sided debates I'd ever seen. In every instance, at every point, the Negative outdebated the Affirmative, destroying the oncase while protecting the offcase. The judges agreed. After the round, they all approached the Negative debater saying that he had dominated the round. The problem was the decision was 2-1 for the Affirmative. The 2 deciding votes, although they believed the Negative performed better, faulted him for not calling abuse when the Affirmative ran a mildly truistic case. When I talked to

one of the judges afterwards, inquiring as to where this idea that if the Negative was the better debater but didn't call abuse he should lose the round, he said that when he had been eliminated at the same tournament, the judges had given him the same reasoning.

Does it promote or harm debate to allow wins on technicalities? Are the general public, those who we train to persuade, persuaded by such things? It is the judge, not the jury, who finds a man not guilty based on a technicality in the law. And when killers are set free due to such things, is the public not outraged? If we truly want to learn to persuade the public, these wins by technicality must instead become technical fouls, and we should throw them out of the game.

Weighing Mechanisms:

Another trend I found surprising as I returned to IPDA was the issue of weighing mechanisms. Whereas before, we adapted our style to the judge(s) in the back of the room, we now tell the judge the way they are to evaluate us. This presents a couple problems.

One of the largest problems I've noticed with the use of weighing mechanisms is the ambiguity of their use within a round. Everyone seems to have an opinion as to who gets to set them, what they may be used for, and which ones are fair and unfair. While each person is confident their use of weighing mechanisms are the correct one, no one is actually sure. While judging, I actually heard one young woman claim that the Affirmative was the only one allowed to set a weighing mechanism, akin to the ability to define terms. The reason for this is simple: weighing mechanisms are never mentioned within the IPDA Constitution. Not once. As you can see, this lack of codification leads to many problems. Does the Affirmative set the mechanism? Does the Negative? Do both sides have to accept the other's mechanism? Should a debater who dominates a round lose because he ignored the artificial restraint placed on him by his opponent? Do we even need weighing mechanisms to begin with?

Frankly, I doubt it.

The entire purpose of a weighing mechanism is to narrow the focus of a round. While there is some virtue in focus, we must realize that in doing so we both limit debate and place restraints on the Negative. The Affirmative has essentially bound the hands of the Negative to creatively construct arguments, instead forcing clash to come in a neat package that the Affirmative is clearly ready for. If the Affirmative is indeed the one allowed to set the weighing mechanism for the round, then it is logical that their scale would be set to tip towards their particular case. Meanwhile, the Negative must spend their 30 minutes preparing cases for Preponderance of Evidence, Resolution of Future Fact, Cost/Benefit Analysis, Comparative Advantage, Independent Voters, and a plethora of other terms invented to advantage one side over the other.

The most notable issue this presents is a lack of education within the round. At the point where the terms of the debate are set exclusively by the Affirmative, many of the Negative's intellectual arguments become moot. When valid arguments are excluded from the marketplace of ideas by the gate of weighing mechanisms, the whole marketplace suffers. The entire point of debate is the testing of ideas, in hopes that through the give and take of argumentation we might be a few steps closer to knowing truth. This process can only work when ideas and arguments are allowed to enter the marketplace without restriction. Imagine the arguments that won't have a chance to be made, the discourse that won't get to happen, the truth that will remain shrouded simply because we wanted to restrict the round.

At the point where the Affirmative sets a weighing mechanism, the Negative really only has two options. Accept the mechanism and lay aside arguments that would greatly contribute to the quality of the round, or argue the mechanism itself. The problem with the latter is the same problem caused by calling abuse. Questioning a person's weighing mechanism means the debate ceases to be about the resolution, and instead becomes about the character of the Affirmative. The Negative either must accept the limited education offered by the artificial restraint of the weighing mechanism, or argue the mechanism itself and lose all chance of an educational round. Neither option seems particularly palatable for a debate community.

Of course, the Negative is free to ignore the mechanism entirely. In the same way, he is free to lose the round. IPDA has accepted the dogma of weighing mechanisms as canon, and thus anyone who opposes them does so to their own peril. I've seen many a round where the negative out-argued their opponent, only to lose the round because he didn't address the weighing mechanism. Again, wins by technicality should be anathema within an academic community.

Looking to the core principles behind IPDA, I have to wonder why we believe weighing mechanisms are even necessary. Our format of debate is distinct from the other collegiate formats because of our focus on the lay audience. Our job is to adapt to them, it is not their job to understand us. We should not be the ones telling them how to judge the round. Instead, we should be trying to adapt to their standards, because that's exactly how it works in the real world.

No jury ever found for a plaintiff because the defendant didn't argue the weighing mechanism. No salesman ever closed a deal based on a technicality. No statesman ever moved an audience through his use of artificial restraint. If we are truly to train for the real world, we must remember first and foremost that speaking is an audience centered sport. We may win the round on a technicality, but at what cost?

The Internet:

I might be showing my age here, but when I left active undergraduate competition, there had only been one tournament where WiFi was freely available. Internet access has become the norm, rather than exception. In fact, if the internet will not be available, programs have been known to protest loudly. One exasperated coach was even heard exclaiming that his debaters didn't know how to debate without the internet. While the world-wide web has become a great tool to aid preparation, it brings with it a couple problems.

First and foremost, the internet has become a crutch. Rather than making sure we're up to date on the latest current events or relying on our team members, we turn to the glowing screens to provide us our arguments. With most controversial topics, and even many that are not, there are pages and pages of prescribed arguments available. Rather than arguments born in the fires of wit and pressure, we are continually flooded with arguments as fresh as canned soup. The creativity in arguments once present has been replaced by prepackaged logic.

IPDA is supposed to be about rhetoric. Other forms of debate focus on policy, evidence, and value, but what makes ours unique is the focus on persuasive verbal skill. Unfortunately, rhetoric has fallen by the wayside in the digital age, and we've let it happen. Rounds are no longer won by the person with a silver tongue, but with the most googled evidence. Facts and figures have replaced ethos, pathos, and logos. Our sources are questioned, anecdotal arguments and pure logic are no longer considered valid, especially compared to what was just pulled off Ask.com. This has dropped the focus on

rhetorical ability and reduced our form of debate into a competition of who can ask Jeeves more questions during prep time.

While evidence is important, it is not the meat of persuasion. The availability of the information superhighway was supposed to help us, but instead has become our handicap. Turn off the internet, unplug the laptops, and force your students to come up with their arguments. They might not have as many statistics, but they'll be far more persuasive.

Conclusion:

If we're able to take an honest look at ourselves and our organization, we can see that we have problems. It's said that every child will grow up to be just like their parents, and we're no different. The same problems in other debate styles that caused the need for IPDA in the first place have slowly but surely crept into our organization. We have followed the same paths as those other organizations and developed the same problems. We see wins by technicality, rampant claims of abuse, and a lack of emphasis on rhetoric. Is it still fun? Is it still educational? Should we still be doing it?

There's no need to throw the baby out with the bathwater, but the baby still needs cleaning. We have to resolve to change, not to some new way, but to go back to the style of debate that made us all love IPDA in the first place. We did things our own way, we had fun, and there was plenty of education to go around. I guess that's why they call them the good 'ole days, isn't it?

Teleconferencing & IPDA: Case study, requirements, budget, and instructions for effective teleconferencing debate.

Chad Freeman
Director of Telecommunications, Henderson State University

Emily Hill
Assistant Director of Telecommunications, Henderson State University

Dr. Robert Steinmiller
Director of Debate, Henderson State University

Ivey Kelley
Captian, Debate Team, Henderson State University

Summary:

On February 28, 2009, Henderson State University hosted a competitor from Oregon State University in the Open Division of The IPDA Reddie to Rumble Debate Tournament. The student competed without leaving his home state; he paid no travel expenses, and slept in his own bed. The student competed through the first ever, active teleconferencing system in IPDA history. The competitor, who is an undergraduate with no university level degree, competed in six official rounds of debate against multiple coaches of debate and graduate students with degrees ranging from Baccalaureate Degrees to Doctorates. The Open Division was chosen because of its small quantity of highly intelligent and experienced debaters. The Oregon student competed against every competitor in the open division. It was determined that these individuals would be the least negatively affected by such a dramatic alternative to the normal concept of live debate. It was also felt that it was a more controlled environment to attend to any situations that may arise from the experiment. The experiment was a complete success. All six rounds were independently deemed fair, official, and valid by both competitors involved, the judge, the Tournament Director, and the President of IPDA. The competitor from Oregon State finished with a record of 1-5 and as a result did not break into outrounds; however, the competitor did win 3rd place speaker in the Open Division.

Exhaustive Budget

Item	Company	Specifications	Price	Amount	Cost
Projection Screen	Da-Lite	70" x 70" Picture King Tripod - Matte White	\$236.00	2	\$472.00
LCD Projector	NEC	Model VT595	\$1,199.00	2	\$2398.00
iMac	Apple	Mac OS X, 2.33 GHz, 2GB RAM	\$1,799.00	2	\$3598.00
Aspire 9410 – Laptop	Acer	Vista Premium, 2.00GHz, 1GB RAM	\$762.50	1	\$762.50
QuickCam Communicate MP	Logitech	1.3 Megapixel Sensor, Built-In Mic	\$49.99	1	\$49.99
2.0 Speaker System	Altec Lansing	BXR1120	\$19.95	1	\$19.95
Mini DVI to VGA Adapter	Apple		\$19.00	1	\$19.00
Pro Series USB Extension Cable	BELKIN	10 ft. Model F3U134-10	\$5.99	1	\$5.99
AV Cart	BRETTFORD	Model "E", 2 Outlet, 10 AMP, 125 Volt	\$69.00	1	\$69.00
3 Outlet Extension Cord Reel	Tasco	25 ft., 16 Gauge	\$19.99	1	\$19.99
CAT 5e Ethernet Cable	Staples	25' – Gray	\$21.98	1	\$21.98
CAT 5e Ethernet Cable	Staples	14' – Gray	\$11.98	1	\$11.98
				Total:	\$7,448.38

This budget includes any and all items used. Many of the items were used to enhance the aesthetic value and give a more personal feel to draw and pre-round communication as well as items that would not be needed had alternative rooms or layouts been available.

Effects on IPDA Format:

A. Time Lag in Cross-Examination

There is a delay in the time it takes for information to pass from competitors to their opponent. This is not an issue during the speeches as they appear to both the competitor and the judge as a consistent flow of thought. In cross-examination, however, a timely response is required to use limited cross-ex time efficiently. There was a consideration of extending the cross-examination time by 15-30 seconds but this was abandoned to hold true to the official IPDA format. Tournament Directors are encouraged to consider extending cross-examination time to account for any delay. In the Reddie to Rumble Tournament, however, there was no change made. There was also no conflict in regards to this delay.

B. Loss of Connection

One issue that was considered in preparation of the tournament is the total loss of connection preventing further debate. The question was posed as to how the round would be awarded. It was determined that loss of connection would result in a forfeit on behalf of the competitor not physically present at the tournament. Telecommunication is the means for a student to compete. It is the same instance as a team's vehicle breaking down in route to the tournament. If their means fails, even at no fault of the competitor, precedence awards the round to their opponent.

C. Speaking Ability Statistics

One interesting aspect that has yet to be fully examined is the change in speaking skills from normal debate to teleconferencing debate. An analysis of all competitors in the open division shows a clear, but minor, increase in average speaking points when in the teleconferencing round. I took an average of all rounds of the non-Oregon competitors excluding rounds using the teleconferencing system (disregarding byes and including High-Lows). I then compared that to the average score of the non-Oregon competitors teleconferencing rounds. The last number I have is the total average score of the Oregon competitor. The numbers are as follows: the average score of a non-teleconferencing round was 33.5, the average score of the same competitors in the video round was 35.66, and the average score from Oregon was 34. There is speculation as to what causes this change. The Hawthorne Effect is one theory to explain the change in performance. Another theory is that through the program used, competitors were able to view their performance in real time. It is possible that this allowed them to correct their non-verbal during their speeches.

D. Room Requirements and Position of Competitors

Initial plans included the judge and a competitor in the same room with a display showing the Oregon competitor. This was abandoned in favor of isolating both

competitors from the judge thus offering a level field in how the judge views the competitors. By requiring both competitors to appear on the display, there is no bias in how the judge awards the round or speaking points. Further, it was determined that the competitors verify that there was no one else in the rooms with them as they competed. This way, there was no way an individual could interact with a competitor during a round outside of the view of the judge. All audience members were asked to view the round from the room with the judge to ensure the highest ethical standards. This unfortunately required two rooms and not the usual one room for each debate, stretching the physical resources of the tournament.

E. Scratching

Scratching, because it is done publicly, was viewed as an opportunity to showcase the technology and systems in use. A display screen was set up so that everyone could view the Oregon competitor as he scratched and so he could communicate effectively with his opponent. One beneficial feature of the program we used was the ability to simultaneously text chat with video chat. The topics were typed in the computer but were not sent until the topic list was handed to the opponent. This eliminated any unethical or unfair situations. The competitors would then simply state the number they wished to scratch, and the competitors would disregard it on their individual lists.

Software

A. Initial Programs

The first program that was tested for use as a teleconferencing medium was iChat. Because the full version is included in all the iMacs used, it was determined to be the best at the time. It was abandoned because it does not allow video chat with individuals on a PC. Because Oregon State did not have access to an Apple computer they were not able to participate through iChat. The second program examined was Skype but was abandoned because it did not have a multi-feed feature in its free version.

B. ooVoo

The program ooVoo was determined the best for the format. Its features include multi-feed chat included in the free version, simultaneous text and video chat, it has the ability to record the round from the view of the program, and it is universally compatible between the iMac and a PC. There were issues when attempting to use ooVoo on the iMacs because the program for Apple is still in the beta stage of development. All of these issues were resolved by switching computers or were not of issue enough to disrupt the tournament.

Minimum Hardware Requirements

These requirements come directly from ooVoo.com via their download page.

For the PC:

- Pentium 4 1Ghz with 256MB of RAM
- 20MB Hard disk space
- Webcam and Headset
- Broadband connection (Cable, DSL etc...)
- Microsoft Windows 2000, XP or Vista

For the Mac:

- Power Mac G5 (1GHz) or Intel Mac with 256MB of RAM
- 20MB hard disk space
- Mac-compatible Webcam and headset
- Broadband connection
- Tiger, Leopard (OSX 10.4 and up)

Optional Equipment

A. Video

Cameras: Most iMacs and Laptops come with a camera included. While these are adequate to perform all required functions, they may not produce the level of quality needed for a successful round of debate. Tournament Directors should consider the use of a USB camera to improve video quality.

Projectors & Screens: Tournament Directors may consider including projection screens in both scratching and in the judges room. For the scratches, it gives a more person-to-person feel than text chat. In the judge's room, it allows the audience to view the round without being close enough to the judge to view or effect the ballet.

B. Audio

Microphones: Like cameras, microphones come standard in most laptops and iMacs; however, they often lack certain features that can enhance the dynamic of debate. Because a competitor may be several feet from the microphone when standing and speaking, a more advanced microphone with ambient noise reduction and echo reduction may be required.

Speakers: Speakers compliment the use of projection systems in that they overcome low quality and volume outputs from standard computer speakers. Also, many low volume speakers will produce an audible hum when adjusted to their highest settings.

C. Connection

Ethernet: Most computers have wireless cards installed prior to purchase. The first video round at Henderson utilized a wireless connection for both computers on Henderson's campus. There were issues with consistency of connection and at one point a large section of a speech was lost and a competitor was forced to start from the beginning of the speech. The use of CAT 5 cables connected directly to a wall connection resolved the issue immediately. Because of this, Tournament Directors are strongly encouraged to use constant Ethernet connections in every round.

Procedure

A. Set-up

Tournament Directors are encouraged to adjust layouts to fit their individual rooms. One major principle must be followed when designing a layout: both competitors and the judge must be in full view of the camera at all times during the round. The computer needs to be placed far enough away from the competitor that they can be viewed both while standing during their speeches but also as they are taking notes during the

opponents speeches. Some computer settings that need to be noted. Be sure to turn off screen savers, automatic sleep timers and other energy saving processes as they will turn off the display or the connection in the middle of the round without warning.

B. Pre-Round

Instruct the competitor and the judge on where to stand and sit. Allow them to see the range of the camera through the “Test Webcam” window on the “File” menu. Assure them they will not be required to adjust the computer. We removed the mouse and keyboard during the rounds to remove the urge to adjust settings. Initiate the connection, and do sound checks. Have the competitors verify there is no one in the rooms with them. Then begin the round.

C. Post-Round

Double check all of the settings. Manually initiate screen savers or turn of the display to avoid damaging the equipment. Be sure to turn off any projectors as the bulbs are expensive to replace.

Troubleshooting

No sound from speakers:

1. Check if speakers are muted
2. Check that correct speakers are selected
3. **Mute then un-mute speakers (Recommended)**

Opponent and judge cannot hear your microphone:

1. Check if microphone is muted
2. Check that correct microphone is selected
3. **Mute then un-mute microphone (Recommended)**

Screen shows picture instead of video on screen:

1. **Check if webcam is on at bottom of window (Recommended)**
2. Check if correct webcam is selected

Screen says video cannot be displayed:

This is the result of poor connection. **Recommend using Ethernet cables or more consistent internet connection if available.**

Audio is choppy or cuts out completely:

This is the result of poor connection. **Recommend using Ethernet cables or more consistent internet connection if available.**

Camera has a blue tint:

This is an issue discovered in the Mac Beta Version. **Recommend using another computer if available.**

Program fails when call is ended: This is an issue discovered in the Mac Beta Version. This issue was not detrimental enough to require a change in computers. **Recommend setting the program to login when started; restart the program after each call.**

There is a low roar throughout the round:

This is most likely the result of ambient noise. For us, the culprit was the air conditioning systems. **Recommend locating and removing the source of the noise** (usually related to the air flow in the room). It may not be possible to completely remove this issue.

There is a pervasive delayed echo:

This is a combination of mixed sensitivity of a participant's microphone with the volume of their speakers. **Recommend lowering the volume of the other participants speakers till the problem does not inhibit clarity of the round.** It may not be possible to completely remove this issue.

Future and Concerns

A. Opportunities

The opportunities made available by this technology are limited only by the imaginations of those using it. Not only does this allow schools to participate in times of budget constraints or excessive time or distance barriers, it will also allow schools to run free, efficient practice rounds against competitors from other schools without disrupting a normal team meeting. This will allow IPDA to spread to areas of the country not within travel distance by most competing schools, allowing IPDA to spread across the country and possibly in other countries, putting the International in IPDA.

B. Concerns

The largest concern as a result of this tournament is that this new system will remove person-to-person debate in favor of this less expensive format. This is unlikely due to the fact of all the different variables that become involved when considering such an option. As the budget shows, it cost Henderson State University over \$7,000 for one competitor. None of these costs were incurred by the debate team because all the technology used was already readily available. This is not the case with large numbers. There were approximately 100 competitors that attended the Reddie to Rumble Tournament. If half of the competitors had chosen to compete via teleconference, the total overall cost on Henderson would be \$372,419.00 to run a tournament of the same quality. Even if a tournament were to use only the Acer Laptop with stock parts, it would require 100 laptops; fifty for the competitors present, and fifty for the judges. This would place the cost at \$76,250.00; still outside the bounds of most universities. Further compounding this is the need for up to 100 available rooms, one for each competitor and judge. Once again this is outside the resources of most universities. Another issue is if all debates were to be held via teleconference, the tournaments would have no way to monitor the rounds. Under the current standard a Texas competitor may face a Louisiana competitor before a Mississippi judge, all within the bounds of an Arkansas tournament. Compare this to a teleconference tournament and you see that with no part of the round being run in or through Arkansas, the Arkansas tournament is no longer in control of the round. Also because the Arkansas tournament was not directly involved in the round the teams

would have no reason to pay registration fees. Because of this, it is unlikely that teleconferencing will ever fully overtake person-to-person debate; however, it is the recommendation to The Governing Board of IPDA that a provision be placed in the by-laws of IPDA that prohibits official tournaments from removing person-to-person debate as a system in their tournament.

TELE-DEBATE: THE FUTURE OF FORENSICS?

Alan Cirlin, Ph.D.
St. Mary's University

Abstract

Given the economic and technological realities of our modern world, traditional forensics tournaments may be on their way out. Travel is expensive and potentially dangerous. Travel can also be extremely time-consuming when a team has to get to some far away tournament. The advent of the Internet and teleconferencing technology suggests the possibility of a low-cost, and potentially more attractive, alternative to the traditional tournament. This essay is a preliminary attempt to explore this possibility and to lay the groundwork for future Tele-Debate Tournaments.

Introduction

An informal discussion took place at the Stephen F. Austin State University tournament in the spring of 2005. It was something less than a formal meeting and something more than a casual hallway conversation. I had gotten a bee in my bonnet about the rising cost of forensics and the possibility of using computer and Internet technology to run a 'virtual' tournament. But what would an Internet debate look and sound like? Would it even work? My thought was to enlist the cooperation of a couple of other coaches, set up a three-way teleconference using our school resources, and then run a remote IPDA debate with one debater each at two different schools and the judge at a third. In addition to what we might learn about Internet-mediated debate, I thought the experiment might eventually lead to a good co-authored convention paper.

So when the opportunity presented itself, I pulled Stephen Jeffcoat and Jorji Jarzabek aside and told them about the idea. They were both enthusiastic. We agreed to check out the equipment and resources on our respective campuses. We would then report back to one another to set up our test debate. But as Robert Frost has so eloquently put it, “. . . knowing how way leads on to way . . . ,” there was very little follow-up from this meeting. In fact, Stephen was the only one who did any initial research. He worked out the system needs and was able to set up a working model of the necessary technology.

And there things stood for about a year. Then, I was able to do some follow up research which led me to the same conclusions that Stephen had reached. While the idea of an Internet debate tournament was basically sound, the technology that would make such an event practical did not yet exist. The basic problems were technology and cost.

School video-conferencing systems had the technical quality and reliability for a teleconference debate. But the usage limitations, bureaucratic requirements, and

expenses associated with this technology make it too expensive, laborious, and limited to use as the basis of a long-distance forensics tournament.

By contrast, ‘over the counter’ web-cam systems were readily available and well within the budget of most forensic programs. But at the time, they lacked the quality and reliability needed to run a virtual tournament.

And beyond equipment, the Internet itself imposed bandwidth and reliability limits which made running a virtual tournament virtually impossible.

But, given the rate of technological improvement, Stephen and I were optimistic that the day would come when hosting a long-distance, mediated, debate tournament would be both technically possible and affordable. And given the current deterioration of the economy and improvement in technology, that day may already be on the immediate horizon.

So the purpose of this paper is to pre-think such a tournament. Hardware aside, there are two big questions which will need to be addressed before any computer mediated tournament would be possible.

1) What might the software requirements be? Is it worth some bright individual’s time and effort to start designing a software package now for such a tournament? Such a design project would, of course, be speculative – but what a jump on the competition. We know how often the first product on the market tends to become the standard. So this paper is, in part, a preliminary sent of design parameters for our bright individual.

2) What would the procedures and other requirements of such a forensics event look like? How about the rules, timetables, forms, postings, etc? And how would the software needs vary and integrate among tournament hosts, tournament directors, coaches, judges, participants, and audience member? This paper will attempt to anticipate the future and answer as many of these questions as possible.

Tele-Debate

I’ve chosen to call this long-distance event “Tele-Debate.” During initial conversations and while working on the convention paper I had called it ‘Virtual Debate.’ But upon reflection, the word ‘virtual’ didn’t make sense. A ‘virtual’ event of any kind does not really exist. A virtual dinosaur exists only in the computer. That didn’t sound right for our distance debating event. I also thought of using the term, ‘Conference Debate’ as in a ‘Conference Call.’ Conference calls are mediated forms of distance communication which often include conflict and debate. But I didn’t like the sound of that term either. A debate is not a conference and I didn’t like the idea of blurring the distinction. Finally, I thought about calling it ‘Mediated Debate,’ since it is debate through and over the media. But this phrase has already been appropriated by those who advocate direct debate coach/judge intervention in debate rounds.

And so I came back to the prefix “Tele” which, as we know, is Greek for ‘distance.’ Telegraph (words at a distance), Tele-phone (sound at a distance), Tele-vision (sight at a distance), and, of course, Tele-communications (communications of all kinds at a distance). I liked the sound of Tele-Debate (TD) and Tele-Debate Tournament (TDT) better than any of the other options. And the more I thought about it, the more comfortable I became with the phrase. So Tele-Debate it became for the convention paper and Tele-Debate it has remained.

Perspectives

What follows is a systematic consideration of the various aspects of a futuristic Tele-Debate Tournament as seen from the perspectives of the main players in such an event.¹

The main perspectives I’ll be considering will be those of the:

Tournament Hosts and/or Directors (HD),
Directors of Forensics and/or Coaches (DoFC),
Debater-Participants (DP),
Judge-Participants (JP), and
IPDA (The Organization and the Executive Secretary).

I will take up this analysis in the order posted above. The main analysis will fall under the perspective of the HD, since everything at the tournament will revolve around the needs and activities of the tournament host and the tabroom director.

The Tournament Hosts and Directors

Where to start? When I first sat down to write this essay I had a lot of ideas and a lot of material. But where should I begin? And how should I organize things? Having given the matter a lot of thought (and after a few false starts), I found that all of this makes the most sense if we begin by looking at the Tele-Debate Tournament (TDT) event from the perspective of the Tournament Host/Director (HD). When organizing the material in this essay, it became obvious that everything revolved around and flowed out of the needs of the HD to design and run the event.

A Tournament CD: If we assume some bright individual has designed a TDT program, it would ideally exist as a simple CD available for purchase, at some not-unreasonable price, from IPDA. A prospective HD buys a copy of the CD and installs it in a personal computer. If our designer was careful, everything loads and runs beautifully.

The CD would be likely to include the following main programs:

¹ I’ve limited this to IPDA debate, both to make this analysis more streamlined and doable, and because IPDA is my main concern and interest. It would be fairly simple to apply this analysis to another format.

1. Some informational files and tutorial programs. These would be optional, but recommended, to the purchaser. The HD could read the informational files and run the tutorial programs from the CD before installing anything.
2. A downloadable, customizable tournament web site. This program would be designed to help the HD set up a completed TDT web site customized to the needs of the host program. It might also include instructional programs for anyone who needed help in setting up a web site.
3. All of the sub-programs needed to run the TDT. These will be discussed in more detail later in this essay.

Having read the basic informational files and gone through the tutorial programs, our HD is ready to set up her TWS.

The Tournament Web Site: Based on my best current thinking, everything associated with TDT would initially be organized around a Tournament Web Site (TWS). This web site would be a kind of hub or Internet touchstone for everyone who was interested in the event. After the tournament started the focus would shift to the tab room. But until then, the TWS would be the center of attention.

The Tournament CD would walk the HD through a customizing process. The program would call up a default version of the site and start asking questions. The HD would answer the questions and/or could make specific modifications of her own along the way. She would provide such information as the tournament name, dates, location, fees, requirements, etc. The program would update all of the materials and forms on the web site. Everything needed for the tournament would be included. The HD could even incorporate graphics into the TWS including the school and/or debate team logos.

The HD would end up with a complete TWS on her personal computer. She could cruise through it to make sure everything was right. She might even be able to test the external links. That is, she could hit a link in her web site and her browser would take her there. But the TWS wouldn't itself be hooked into the Internet yet, so no one else could access the site from the outside. Then with the help of an ISP and/or a school computer guru, this web site would be set up on a host computer and be open for business.

What might the TWS look like? As I envision the site as include the following sections:

Main Page: The main page of the web site could be customized to include any number of things. A school graphic. An announcement of the tournament. A message of welcome from the HD. Some marketing features about the tournament. Whatever. There would be a clear and intuitive set of site links so interested individuals could quickly find what they were looking for.

Official Tournament Invitation Page: There could be a special section with an Internet version of the official tournament invitation. Press a button and that invitation could be downloaded or sent to a printer if you wanted a hard copy.

Tournament Details and Requirements Page: Another section would describe the nature, rules, procedures, schedules, and requirements of participation in the Tele-Debate tournament. Participation would require that participating debaters and coaches have the proper computer equipment and software. So there would be a link to another section about these requirements.

Hardware-Software Set-Up Page: The equipment-software page would include a description of the proper hardware (and perhaps some links to where it could be obtained over the Internet). This section could include all of the software that participating DoFC s or any of their debaters would need to run the hardware. These downloads would be included with the TDT-CD. The downloads might also be made available on the IPDA website. And each download might include a double check system to insure software was installed correctly and that the hardware was working properly.

Registration Page: There would be a registration page with all of the usual items you'd expect to find when registering for a forensics tournament. This could be customized for each tournament at the same time the TWS was being set up.

Fee Calculation/Payment Page: The registration process would also include a fee calculation page. The fee calculations would automatically take place as the registration form was completed. And with the proper set up, a DoFC would be able to pay the registration fee with a credit card.

A Links Page: The TWS might also include a set of links to other web sites, such as:

- The Host School
- The Host Forensics Team
- A Tabroom Link -- Operational Only During the Tournament
- The Main IPDA Web Site
- The Home Pages for Individual Forensics Team Members
- Resource content links related to a tournament topic theme if there was one
- Etc.

I'm sure the final version of such a TDT web site will be significantly different from my conception presented above. On the other hand, this description was only intended to be a useful starting point for thinking about a TDT software design project. Hopefully it will be useful toward this end. And whatever the final design, I'm reasonably confident that some form of TDT Web site should serve as the main hub for the event.

An Email Tournament Announcement/Invitation system: The TDT-CD could also include a built in system for emailing the tournament invitation out. Just plug a set of Email addresses into the program and once the invitation is ready, it can be sent out automatically. The same would be true for additional announcements, updates, and corrections concerning the tournament.

Hosting Requirements: Hosting any tournament involves making sure you've got all of your material needs, facilities needs, personnel needs, etc. covered. I tried to envision the main needs to host a TDT and came up with the following list:

A physical site for the tournament headquarters (THQ): It may eventually be possible to host a TDT using a staff of individuals who are scattered far and wide around the world. Then again, this may never be possible. But even if possible, it may never be desirable. So I think it would be best for the large majority of staff members to be physically located in close proximity.

Lots of bandwidth: This is another technical issue which is likely to change over time. But video conferencing technology tends to be bandwidth intensive. I don't have enough expertise to discuss this in detail, so I mention it and leave it to the techno-geeks to work out the requirements.

Lots of computer capacity: As with bandwidth, the main THQ computer is going to be very busy. The HD needs to be sure that the computer system will be sufficiently muscular and reliable to handle the load. How big would that be? This is another question for the techno-geeks to answer.

Sufficient technical support staff: The HD better have someone, or a small crew of someones, available to deal with technical problems in real time as they might occur. It's better to have them available and not need them, than to need them and not have them available.

Sufficient non-technical helpers: The HD is likely to need the help of a whole lot of 'gophers.' [For anyone unfamiliar with this term, it refers to the grunts who are available to run errands. They 'go fer' this and 'go fer' that.] Aside from fetching coffee and organizing materials, the gopher staff may be called upon to fill a wide variety of tournament rolls.

Lots of telephone capacity: The HD better have another small crew available to deal with problems in real time as they are called in. I would expect a semi-constant stream of phone calls and Internet messages.

Contact phone numbers: This may sound more like a procedural issue than a physical need. But I believe that the tabroom will need a list of telephone contact numbers for every debater, judge, and coach to make a TDT run smoothly. I therefore include this requirement as part of this list.

An official set of tournament rules and procedures: TDTs would require some strict adherence to procedure to work. And those procedures would need to be carefully worked out and laid down in writing so that everyone would know what they are. The tab room should have a written copy of these rules and procedures available.

Traditional supplies: It almost goes without saying that the tabroom will need various physical supplies to run a TDT. The needs may not be as extensive as for a traditional tournament, but I don't think the use of computers would eliminate those needs entirely. People need scratch pads, something to write with, calculators, paperclips. etc. And let's remember the care and feeding of the tabroom personnel. You're likely to need a lot of junk food, caffeine, and potables (not to mention some 'good' food for the Tournament Host and the Tabroom Director).

Virtual Machine Interfaces: Another feature of the TDT bright individual CD program might be a heavy use of Virtual Machine Interfaces (VMI) to make things as simple, intuitive, and idiot-proof as possible. I'll come back to these VMIs individually for each category of participant below, but we can consider the HD and some of the Telephone Gophers here.

When the Tabroom Director fires up her computer on tournament day, what first appears on the screen might resemble a physical control panel. There would be categories of buttons for different functions. This button takes you to the topics page. The next button calls up a list of judges, organized by round. The next button takes you to the current tournament results and standings page. And so on.

The Line Between the Tabroom and the Tournament: The VMI would create a kind of boundary between the tournament participants and the tabroom. This is analogous to a conventional tournament and tabroom. The room is set physically apart. Participants can get messages through, but they are encouraged to NOT disturb the tabroom creatures in their lair.

Some materials, such as cum sheets, remain in the tabroom and are kept strictly private until the tournament is over;

Some materials, such as the topics for each round, start out as private but become public as the tournament progresses; and,

Other materials, such as the tournament schedule and pairings, starts out as public information and if changes are made they get posted as quickly as possible.

At a traditional tournament, keeping the private material private can be a problem. I imagine it would be less of a problem at a TDT. The CD program would know what it's doing and it would be much more difficult for the occasional nosey coach to slip into the virtual tabroom and steal a glance at the cum sheet. You'd still have the problem of gopher informants or VIP spies. And you'd still have the problem of gabby HDs. But

there's nothing unique in all that. The bottom line is that confidentiality would be easier to maintain at a TDT.

Automatic Task Performance: One of the big advantages of a TDT, assuming it is being run from a central computer, would be the potential for the automatic performance of certain tasks. A last-minute drop would be no problem at all. The computer could make all of the necessary changes and then post them automatically. Such a system could perform many, if not most, of the tournament tasks automatically and help insure things kept running on schedule.

Debaters and judges would not be able to 'go to the wrong room' because the computer wouldn't let them. Everyone would check into their rounds through the main system. As a procedure, debaters and judges might be directed to fire up their systems and log into their rounds 5 minutes early. But even if they showed up at the last possible second, it wouldn't faze the computer. If a round were running late, the system could make automatic adjustments and send out warning messages without losing any time in the process. And there would be no 'passing' time required for a debater or a judge to get from one round to the next.

When it was time for a round to start, the computer would automatically release topics to all debaters in all divisions at once. The tabroom would get a warning a few minutes before the draw was scheduled to take place. This would let them put the draw on hold if there were some need to do so. Otherwise, the draw would take place automatically, exactly on time, for every round.

Ballots would be distributed, collected, and recorded, automatically. The tabroom wouldn't even need to look at ballots unless they wanted to do so. Warning lights and/or buzzers would sound on the virtual machines to alert the tabroom to any irregularities or problems that required human intervention. All of the tournament record keeping, calculations, and form preparations would take place automatically behind the scenes.

The Virtual Tournament Environment: In addition to the administration of the tournament and the organization of individual debate rounds, the TDT program could create a Virtual Tournament Environment (VTE). This virtual environment would be designed to make the tournament experience easier and more rewarding for the participants. There might be some special chat-type 'rooms' set up in the program to allow for individual and group interactions outside the strict limitations of the competition.

A Virtual Tournament Lounge: Any participant could poke the 'lounge' button and the screen would fill with the names of everyone who happened to be in the lounge at the moment. By poking that button, the participant's name would be added to this list. The rest of the tournament participants, who were not in the lounge, might be listed at the bottom of the screen, or on a separate page. Or the program might list all the participants and simply highlight or star anyone who happened to be available in the lounge.

Virtual Tournament Prep-Rooms: The TDT program could also set up one or more virtual Prep Rooms for small groups or teams to use when sharing information or ideas about their upcoming debates. Each prepping debater could be identified on the main screen by school, side, and topic. In this way you could invite one or more individuals to work with you on an upcoming round.

And that's about as far as my speculations took me with respect to the tournament host, the tournament director, tournament administration, and the tabroom.

The Directors of Forensics and Coaches

In some ways, the 'coaching' perspective was the easiest and in many ways simplest to predict. Which I suppose means, I've missed the important points completely. Oh well, time may tell. But it seemed to me that a TDT would be much easier for a DoFC to 'attend' than a traditional tournament would be. There would be many fewer costs and problems associated with setting up the tournament, vehicle rental, travel, hotel, etc.

The Set Up: Once the initial few TDTs had been completed, all of the hardware and software systems would presumably be in place and de-bugged. The only need in this regard would be to bring new team members and judges on line. And as the number of team members grew who were already familiar with setting up new web-cam systems, the coach would have a pool of helpers to whom this task could be delegated. So things might become progressively easier for the DoFC over time in this regard.

Having read the tournament invitation and gone through all of the nonsense associated with setting up the technology, the DoFC would arrange his entry in the usual way. Debaters and Judges would be identified and the necessary information about each collected, then the entry would be submitted over the Internet.

Long Term Records: To make things even easier for the DoFC, the TDT CE could include a semi-permanent list of debaters and judges in its data base. So instead of having to retype data for each tournament entry, the DoFC would record each new team member and judge into his own system. Then for a new tournament, he need only point and click to add debaters or judges.

The Physical Arrangement: On the day of the tournament, individual DoFCs would have a lot of flexibility about how to physically set up their participants. At one school, the whole team and possibly the judges, might assemble in one room. At another, the DoFC could break the participants into groups based on division or experience or food preferences. At yet another, the DoFC might have all of his participants debating individually from their dorm rooms or homes.

Location: The DoFC himself would likely choose to come on campus for the tournament. But that wouldn't be a necessity. The big cheese would have the option of staying home and running things from bed.

No more ballot inspection: This might be a minor issue, but the use of the computer system would essentially eliminate the need for a ballot inspection period during the tournament. The judge might have made a mistake of some kind – but once the system had accepted the ballot, the tabroom records would not indicate what that error might be. For example, if the judge meant to give one speaker a 5 on delivery and only gave her a 4, this wouldn't be detectable or correctable by the tabroom. And the calculations, which are all done by the computer, wouldn't be in error unless the whole system was on the fritz. So there might be very little for a DoFC to inspect.

Additional Possibilities: The use of computer technology for mediating a tournament also presents some nice possibilities from the coaching perspective. From the comfort of his VMI a DoFC could drop in on any of the debates going on at the tournament and listen in. The DoFC could also record any or all of these debates for later discussion and analysis.

As I said, I found thinking about the TDT from the perspective of a DoFC to be the least difficult aspect of this research project. By-in-large, at least as far as my fuzzy ability to envision the possibilities is concerned, a TDT would, in many ways, make the DoFC's life simpler rather than more complex.

The Judge-Participants

Given IPDA's emphasis on lay judges, the TDT would have to make things simple and keep them that way for the Judge-Participants (JP). The ideal, consistent with fulfilling the administrative needs of the HD and the educational needs of IPDA, is to put minimal strain on the judges and make their participation as enjoyable and rewarding as possible.

Signing up new judges: Initially, registering a new JP for a TDT would be a bit more complex than for a traditional tournament. The DoFC would send new judges to the internet to pull up the Judging Background Form (JBF). The judge would fill it out online. But once this information was entered into the main IPDA computer, the judge would never have to repeat this process again, except for recording changes. But simply registering a new JBF would not make that judge official.

Orientation and training for new judges: Once registered, the judge would access an official Lay-Judges Orientation/Briefing/Training program (OBT-P) web page on the main IPDA web site. All they would need to do is watch a short video training program and perhaps pass a simple test about it. Then, having completed the OBT-P the individual would forever after be registered as an officially qualified IPDA judge.

The JPs TDT Experience: From the perspective of the JP, the whole tournament experience might start out seeming a bit futuristic and alien. When it was close to the time they were scheduled to judge, a JP would go to her computer, access the tournament web site, click on the judges' link, and find her name on the judges' page.

There would be a countdown timer for the next debate she was scheduled to judge. All of the information she would need about the topics and the debaters would be there as well. And everything would be very intuitively organized on her VMI. There could be a big reminder message to stand-by her contact phone before, during, and after the debate (until she had returned their ballot and gotten her confirmation message, after which she would be free to go). The VMI screen would include a tabroom contact phone number.

When the countdown timer reached zero, the debate would begin. A split screen might come up with the two debaters appearing as they, themselves, logged into the TDT web site for the round. Once the debate started, the JP could simply sit and watch. Many of the tasks lay judges often perform at traditional tournaments would be handled by the computer. There would be no need, for example, for the JP to keep track of time or to provide time signals.

From the perspective of the very lay judge, there would be no need to worry about anything except concentrating on the debate and entering speaker point information. And the JP's system might also record the event to make judging easier. This would allow the judge, if she so desired, to review all or part of the debate afterward.

The JP's VMI: The VMI for judges could also admit the possibility of letting the judge type notes into the computer while the debate is in progress. These notes could appear on a separate window, or they might appear as text which was superimposed over the debater's video image.

Delayed Adjudication: TD has another unique advantage. Since each round is automatically translated into digital form for transmission, any round could be easily recorded. So if there happened to be a judging shortage during one round, or if a judge didn't show up, or if some judge had to be disqualified for any reason, it would be rather easy to have some other judge view the recording and adjudicate the round at some later time.

Filling out the ballot: Once the round was over, and everyone had said their thank yous and goodbyes, it would be time for the judge to fill out the ballot. And the tabroom could easily set controls in such a way that 'oral critiques' – which cause so many tournaments to run late – would be impossible. Within a minute or so of the end of the round, communication between the judge and debaters could simply stop. On the other hand, oral critics could be built right into the ballot.

And this is where a TDT could make things VERY easy for Lay judges. The Virtual ballot would be part of the VMI for the round. **I envision the TDT ballot as a two-part form.** It would follow the content and style of the standard IPDA paper ballot, but there would be some big differences.

Part one of the form: The basic who won: 'Aff or Neg?' and 'Which debater?' double-check redundancy would still be there. In fact, you could add a third level of verification, ask the judge to click on one of two images of the debaters taken

during the round. The computer would not accept the decision, unless all three answerers were in agreement.

Then you'd have speaker points, which might be filled out during as well as after the round. This point grid, with which we are all familiar, could appear in a separate box, or it could be superimposed over a speaker's image during a debate. The VMI might include a 'help' link on the speaker-point chart which would take the JP to a generic advice page about how to fill out speaker points and what the point totals mean.²

In any event, part one of the ballot would be completed entirely, by pointing, clicking, and punching numbers. The form would have to be filled out properly and there would be no possibility of missing data or addition errors. And, in the event of a 'low-point win,' this would be pointed out to the JP and she would be asked to either verify that this was her intention, or she would be asked to adjust speaker points so that the winner had an equal or higher point total. Imagine that, no more confusion over low-point wins.

Part one of the form could/should/would be submitted very quickly following the end of the debate.

Part two of the form: This would be equivalent to the various comments sections on the standard ballot. For each debater – what were their biggest strengths and areas for improvement? For the debate in general – what were the general comments and reason for decision. HOWEVER, in addition to or instead of the option of writing out comments, JPs could provide a recorded 'oral critique' which would become a part of the ballot and could be distributed back to the various debaters and coaches when the TDT was over. In other words, the judge could fill out part two of the ballot without ever typing a word.

Tabroom verification of ballots: As mentioned above, judges could be required to complete and return part one of the ballot within a certain time limit following the end of the debate. If this didn't happen on time, the system would prompt the judge, the tabroom, and the JP's DoFC. But once the ballot did come in, the main TDT computer could send the judge and both debaters a confirmation message. Basically, this would be a 'you can leave now' message. Until then, both debaters and judge would remain on stand-by, waiting somewhere in earshot of their telephones.

Real time communication with the tabroom: Unlike traditional tournaments, the TDT VMI would allow a JP to contact and communicate with the tabroom and vice-versa at any time during or immediately after the debate. The staff of gophers could field inquiries or concerns from JPs and the HD would have the advantage of being able to verify information almost immediately by computer or by phone. So not only would the judges – both lay and experienced – be on a tighter leash, they would also have access to a much greater level of assistance if they required such.

² To see a judging handout sheet from the past, contact IPDA or the author.

The Debater-Participants

This may be the most important perspective to consider when thinking about TDTs. If the whole point of academic debate is the care and training of our student debaters, we'd better be sure, as a debate association, to get this part right.

The DPs TDT Experience: What would an IPDA Tele-Debate Tournament experience be like from the perspective of a Debater. For the DP, the advanced preparation for a TDT might be quite similar to that for a traditional tournament. The student would sign-up, practice, prepare, and be ready to go come tournament day.

Check-In: For a traditional debate tournament, involving travel, the main check-in takes place as a kind of group exercise. At a home campus tournament, folks may wonder in separately. So check-in for a TDT would probably feel more like check-in for a traditional home tournament.

The Grey Zone: Between check-in and the first round, there is a period of time between which I think of as a "Grey Zone." That is, I know a lot of things are likely to be going on during this time, but I find it hard to envision them, vis a vis a Tele-Debate, with any clarity. I just can't predict this activity well enough to discuss it here. Lots of different options are likely to be available for the DPs to spend their time on. And as with a traditional tournament, various DPs may use this time in a variety of different ways.

Pre First Round: OK, it's almost time for round one to begin. The DP has checked her system – everything is working. She's checked the postings and identified her opponent and judge. She's read the judge's background information sheet. Perhaps she's spent some time in the virtual lounge talking with other debaters to see how much can learn about her opponent and judge. Then time runs out, as it inevitably does; a warning light/buzzer on her system goes off. DPs can set their advanced warnings for any time they like. In her case, round one begins in three minutes.

Round One – Topic Selection: The DP pushes the debate button on her VMI screen and is taken to the start of round one. All the necessary information is on the screen: Start time. Opponent, Side (in this case she's negative), Judge, etc. She has the option of making advanced contact with either the opponent or the judge to ask a question, say hello, or whatever. There is a count-down timer showing on one corner of the screen. 1:23 left until the topic draw.

Another buzzer/light goes off. Five topics appear on the screen. The affirmative has some set time – say 2 minutes – to make the first strike. The countdown timer resets to 2 minutes. Once her opponent makes his strike, the countdown timer resets again and our DP will have two minutes to make her first strike. When the last strike is struck, the final topic appears on the screen and the countdown timer switches over. It now informs the debaters and the judge how much time remains before the start of the debate.

But what if time runs out, and the first debater has failed to make a strike? Unless there was a tabroom override, the clock would reset and the negative would get to make the first two strikes. Then the process would return to normal. And if the opponent hasn't shown up at all, the negative would make the second two strikes as well. She would, thus, select the final topic. Then the round would proceed as it normally would just as if one of the debaters hadn't been lost in the ether during the topic draw.

Round One – Prep Time: Now it's prep time. Because a TDT is run through the Internet, it means that every competitor can be expected to have access to Internet search engines, news sites, and debate sites for prep time. This may, in large part, eliminate the need for bulky, extemp-type prep files. Or it might mean that big physical files would be replaced by a keychain sized flash drive. Debaters could access those prep files using the same computer they use for the TDT.

Meanwhile, the timer keeps counting down. 1 minute to go, our DP takes her position and gets ready. The screen is still blank. Oh dear, she forgets to push the ready button on her VMI. She does so. The screen splits two ways. On the left is her opponent who seems to be checking his notes. On the right is the judge who looks a bit apprehensive himself.

The system might admit the possibility of at least two web-cam views. A log shot and a close up. This much could be easily accomplished with one camera of good quality and software. In this case, both opponent and judge are seen in the large view. But our DP prefers close-ups to better see facial expressions. She clicks some buttons and the views enlarge.

The countdown timer indicates 6 seconds to go . . . 5 . . . 4 . . . 3 . . . 2 . . . 1 . . . And a final light/buzzer. The screen now has a banner message across the bottom: Round 1 – Resolution: It's time to move it, move it. – Affirmative: Hari Berry, Farmer's College. – Negative: Ohno Enyo, University of the Mysterious. Hari has begun his speech. The banner at the bottom of the screen keeps repeating until Ohno turns it off.

Round One – The Debate: If one debater doesn't show up on time, there would be some delay period allowed for a late arrival. This would be preset for the tournament by the HD. A grace period of five or ten minutes might be reasonable. After that, the missing debater forfeits the round and any protests would shift to the tabroom. But assuming everything starts on time, the Tele-Debate itself might appear to be reasonably similar to a traditional debate.

The first speaker finishes. He presses his 'end' button. The system records this and informs the judge of how long the speech lasted. If it went overtime, an alert icon to this effect might light up. Once the 'end' button is pushed, a countdown timer begins for the cross-examination. There may be a 30 second break allowed here. If the opponent hasn't hit the start button by then, time will begin automatically. The question and answer session looks really cool to the lay judge who watches the two debaters go at it on his split screen.

When the C-X period is over, the questioner hits her end button. There is another countdown – say one minute – to the next speech. And again, once time is up, if the negative hasn't hit her start button, the speech time will begin automatically.

[What happens if the speaker begins early and doesn't hit the start button at all? Does that give the debater an extra two minutes of speaking time? Not really. The audio feed doesn't begin until the virtual start button is pressed. So the opponent and judge can see Ohno's lips moving, but there is no sound. The judge presses an alert button and an alarm goes off on Ohno's computer. There is an alert panel on the side of each screen with a short list of common messages. This one reads: "We can't hear you – Press your start button and begin again." Ohno does.

After the Debate: When the final speech is over, and the final button is pushed, everyone is on stand-by. The debaters can get up and wander around, but they should keep in earshot of the computer and of their stand-by phone. If everything runs smoothly, the judge completes the first part of the ballot and sends it. The tabroom computer records that ballot automatically. Then it automatically sends a tabroom confirmation message to both debaters and to the judge. Now, they are all free to wander off. The judge still owes the tabroom the second half of the ballot, but that can be submitted later – even much later. And if part two never comes in, it does not affect the tournament.

And so on: Soon it's time for round two and the process simply repeats itself. Eventually, the last preliminary round is over and it's time to post the breaks and the pairings for the outrounds.

Posting Breaks and Pairings: Breaks could appear on the web site just moments after the last ballot came in. Since the computer is doing all the computations this would be no problem at all. On the other hand, the tabroom might set the system to hold the results until the humans had a chance to look them over first.

Also, in a traditional debate tournament, the outround contestants are posted as soon as possible let the debaters know who is going on and who is out of the running. Then, an intermission is usually scheduled to let the coaches, judges, and competitors get some food and catch their breath. But while everyone else is taking a break, the tabroom is working at a furious pace to set up the outround pairings, rooms, and judges. But at a TDT, the computer could calculate all this at the same time it was figuring the breaks. So everything could be posted at the same time, almost immediately after the final ballot came in. The decision, to include an intermission for food and recovery, would become an option rather than a necessity.

Outrounds: I would expect the outround debates to run very much like the preliminary rounds. But some adjustments would have to be made. Obviously you've got three or more judges. Debaters could look up the background-philosophy sheets for all of their outround judges. That's no big adjustment. But how to show them on the computer screen? Going from 2 to 4 or more faces cuts each image down by at least half. This would be, to some degree, the debater's problem. But perhaps the software could help.

Outround Results: As with the preliminary rounds, results could be posted as soon as the ballots were in. They could be posted for each round separately or for all rounds at once. And as with the preliminary rounds, the pairings and judges for the subsequent outround could be posted as soon as the computer had it worked out and the tabroom was ready to release the results.

Awards: The subject of awards turned out to be an extremely interesting aspect of TDTs – at least as a thought experiment.³ Given the virtual nature of the tournament, there would be no compelling need to go to the trouble and expense of providing physical trophies. Each tournament could design and award virtual trophies as images which participants could download and print and which could be posted indefinitely on a tournament web site.

Feedback: Once the tournament was over, or on whatever schedule the tabroom decides to release ballots and cum sheet data, it would immediately become available. DoFCs could specify in advance as part of their registration form whether ballots were to be returned exclusively to the coach, to the coach and individual debaters, or made public to all interested parties. And since these preferences would be pre-loaded into the system, debaters might be able to get their ballots automatically and quickly as soon as they were scheduled for release.

The International Public Debate Association

Our discussion so far covers the main perspectives of the individuals who would participate in a TDT. But there is one more, behind-the-scenes perspective that I'd like to consider. I've labeled it the International Public Debate Association, but as a practical matter it's the perspective of the IPDA Executive Secretary.

The Executive Secretary: The IPDA Executive Secretary is the individual who does all of the tournament sanctioning and is responsible for keeping track of all the results. I can tell you from personal experience that tracking down results, checking out and correcting errors, and maintaining the IPDA web site were the biggest part of the job. These were the tasks that sucked up the most time, and led to some of the biggest sources of friction and annoyance.

IPDA and a TDT: For a TDT, the reporting requirements for IPDA would be performed automatically by the computer. Once the last ballot was in, and the results checked and certified by the HD, a button would be pushed. This would cause all of the tournament data required by IPDA to automatically download into the IPDA web site. The web pages would automatically update and all of the necessary information would be added to the Executive Secretary's files. Bingo. Done.

³ This section on Internet awards is greatly expanded as a flight of speculative fantasy in the original convention paper. The possibility is raised of creating three-dimensional and even animated virtual trophies.

Possible Benefits for IPDA: Beyond the ways in which computer and Internet technology can help achieve the everyday bureaucratic requirements of administering a debate association, I believe that computer and Internet technology hold a great potential promise for IPDA. If this association were to get in on this potential first. . . . And if IPDA should be the debate association which leads in the development of TDT software, web sites, and the procedures to make it all work, it would probably have a number of very positive impacts on the future of our association.

The public relations value, if properly pushed, might be enormous. Consider the possibilities if IPDA were to successfully sponsor and promote the first Tele-Debate Tournaments.

First, we would be the first. And that's always a big plus when introducing something new. It's like presumption in debate. If you want media recognition for your achievement, but you weren't the first one on the scene, you'd better have some other, really impressive, claim to greatness.

Second, given that we're using Internet technology and expenses will be minimal, we could make this a truly international enterprise from the start. If the first HD would just recruit one or two debaters on the East Coast to enter, a couple more from the West Coast, and perhaps a handful of others from countries such as Canada, England, Israel, and Australia, this premiere event would also be a truly international contest.

Third, with a little work, IPDA might be able to attract some national media attention. After all, we're at least national with debaters from both coasts entered and possibly international as well. And the computer technology means we would have some excellent video clips to go with the story.

Fourth, this story could be pushed to the media in a number of ways. Aside from the obvious debate aspect, which may be of the least interest, you've got:

- The software development angle,
- The video-conferencing angle,
- The money-saving, business angle,
- The new technology/Internet angle, and
- The general educational/pedagogy angle.

Fifth, someone could dress up the IPDA web site with a TDT section and include some downloadable clips from the tournament. These should include some of the most impressive tournament moments. IPDA might decide to post some entire debates as well.

Sixth, TDTs would offer a real opportunity to develop a wider audience interest in public debate. Instead of having to show up in person to a real-time event, to see

what's going on, potential audience-observers could simply listen in on their computers. They could select which debate to listen to based on any kind of filtering criteria: School, debater, topic, round. And they wouldn't have to listen to the debate while it was taking place. Recorded debates might be available for any length of time following the tournament. This could be a chance to build a real audience for IPDA.

With a bit of luck this would not only give the IPDA format a gigantic P.R. boost, it might do as much or more for the professional careers of the leaders in this association. This is something that's really worth thinking about, people. But the time to start thinking about it is now.

Some Additional Issues

The purpose of this paper was NOT to try to work out *all* of the future details of Tele-Debate and exactly what a TDT might require and look like. The purpose of this paper WAS to guesstimate the approximate look and feel of what TD and a TDT might be like. And this was done as a starting point for future discussion and research. So let me conclude by offering a short list of additional issues which cropped up while working on this writing project.

Etiquette Issues: How should we train our students to project politeness in a Tele-Debate? What are the potential hazards they should learn to avoid?

Stylistic Issues: Etiquette aside, what kinds of stylistic differences are likely to exist between real-world debate and TD? A critical goal of IPDA is to help train our debaters to better persuade real audiences. Our student-speakers are supposedly learning to be effective advocates before real-world audiences in the face of active opponents. Would this skill require a different style of presentation when speaking before a web-cam?

Procedural Issues: Beyond the guesswork presented above, how would participation in a TDT change various forensics procedures? We've got procedures for just about every aspect of IPDA from team practice sessions to tournament administration to reviewing post-tournament ballots. All of these procedures from every perspective might have to be rethought.

Marketing Issues: At present, there is only a modest need for HDs to 'market' or 'sell' their tournaments. The cost of travel limits many, if not most, forensic programs to attending tournaments in their own geographic region. But TD might open a whole world of possibilities for DoFCs. Why not attend the Oxford tournament in England instead of the tournament across town. And this raises all kinds of questions about how IPDA tournaments should be scheduled and marketed.

But TD may also allow individual forensics programs to greatly increase in size. They might no longer be limited by their travel budget. And this suggests a greatly expanded

demand for tournaments of all sizes, so I suspect that big prestigious tournaments would not be likely to drive the smaller ones out of business.

Practical Issues: One very important practical issue about TDT s is how big they should be allowed to become. The Internet and computers may, at least theoretically, permit hundreds or even thousands of entries for a single tournament. But tournament administration is not entirely a matter of computers, is it? There are still all of those participants who may call in with problems. So an ideal maximum size for a TDT and/or a ratio of participants to Host School resources will have to be worked out.

All this raises another practical concern: what about competition from other forensics associations. Assuming IPDA jumps on the TD possibility ahead of everyone else and make it work beautifully, I would expect other forensics leagues to follow along quite quickly. What might this co-existence look like and what coordination would be required to make it work.

One other practical issue facing TDTs involves judging. In what ways would the judging pool be affected?

Economic Issues: Money is a practical issue which borders on the ethical. It's also a driving issue so I gave it a category of its own. And I'm not going to delve too deeply into this issue. But one major concern is how to decide that the time is right. How much money would we have to save before IPDA launched into sponsoring TDTs? A second major question would be, how should revenue s be divided between the tournament host, tabroom personnel, the CD software developers, and IPDA.

Ethical Issues: Tele-Debate is likely to create a whole new set of ethical issues and problems. How can or should we control the 'reading' of evidence when you can't see or prove that a Tele-Debater is doing so? What, if any, limits should be placed on using the Internet as a prep-time resource? What ethical or even legal limits should be placed on the use of recorded materials from TDTs? Would you like to see your greatest verbal stupidity in a debate round posted on YouTube and made available for all eternity?

If there are to be ethical rules, to what degree should they be formalized as written laws, to what degree should they be set out as guidelines and merely encouraged, and to what degree should they be allowed to evolve as customs? What should the penalties be for violation of various rules? And how should rules be policed and enforced?

Conclusion

This paper may leave the reader thinking Tele-Debate is nothing more than a kind of science fiction. If so, you may feel it's best left in the realm of light speculation. On the other hand, Tele-Debate already exists in the real world. Every time you see a pair of split screen, talking heads on a news program, you're watching a crude kind of Tele-Debate. "We have with us tonight, Ben Heartfelt, Chairman of the *Liberal Coalition for Do-Gooding*, joining us from Softwood, California. And with us also, is Betty Bottomline,

Director of the Conservative Think-Tank, *Kill-the-Beast*. She's joining us from Rockton, New York. Betty, let's start with you . . .”

Or consider the corporate move to teleconferencing, which saves all kinds of money associated with travel. Surely, some of those teleconference discussions involve disagreements which turn into informal debates. The media has shown the U.S. president in teleconference discussions with the president of Iraq. We also saw him being briefed by teleconference on Hurricane Katrina just before it hit. So this technology must be in growing use at all levels of government and must also be a growing trend around the world.

Oratory has always made use of technology. And each new technology requires the development of new skills sets. Early speakers had to learn to project their voices in natural amphitheatres. Centuries later orators were learning to communicate effectively using electronic amplifiers, radio, television, and now the internet. If the future is going to involve Internet mediated debate, it is important our students develop skills to communicate effectively using this technology.

Tele-Debate and TDTs should not do away with traditional forms of debate. People will always gather to discuss problems and argue about the best way of solving them. So traditional, real-time, face-to-face debating skills will always have a place in forensics education. But Tele-Debate may very well be the wave of a quickly advancing future. So preparing ourselves to teach our students to effectively debate through this medium might be a wonderful addition to our forensics curriculum.

Participation and Success Rates for Women and Minorities in IPDA Debate

Bob Alexander, Bossier Parish Community College
 Joe Ganakos, Lee College
 Trey Gibson, Louisiana State University - Shreveport

Abstract

Historical data has indicated inequality in both participation rates as well as competitive success of women and minorities in intercollegiate debate. This study seeks to take a snapshot of the current demographic makeup of IPDA debate in comparison to the current demographic makeup of collegiate enrollments. Furthermore, the study seeks to determine whether women and minority competitors have experienced equality in competitive success when compared with male and majority competitors. Evaluation of the data indicates that the organization has made strides over historical inequalities, yet proportional representation inline with collegiate enrollment figures has not yet been achieved. Furthermore, the data indicates that competitive success correlates more strongly with experience than race and/or gender, and thus the authors postulate that the community must move toward both recruitment and retention efforts for underrepresented demographics.

Review of Literature

For more than 35 years, forensics organizations have sought methods to create greater gender and ethnic equality (Murphy; Manchester & Friedley; Millsap & Millsap). Beyond simple participation rates, organizations have also focused upon competitive success as well as retention rates. Rogers (et al) noted that "...the percentages for women decrease markedly and minority participation becomes almost negligible when the competitors are eligible for promotion to the Open division. Women and minority participation drops between 50 and 75 percent after their first year of competition" (page 3).

An initial review of the literature illustrates that disparities are present at varying degrees through each major intercollegiate debate organization. Recent data for NFA-LD shows a trend toward greater equality, though disparity still exists. Rogers (et al) showed a decreased percentage of white-male involvement in LD debate (with white males making up 71%, 68% and 64% of the field in the novice division and 78%, 77%, and 68% of the field in the open division for the years 1990, 1995 and 2000, respectively), though these numbers continue to show a disparity from the general collegiate population. Millsap and Millsap's study of the 2000 and 2005 NFA-LD Championship Tournament's also showed a trend toward greater gender equality with 28% female participation in 2000 increasing to 42% female participation in 2005.

Furthermore Millsap and Millsap noted that female competitors won 29% of their preliminary rounds in 2000 increasing to 45% of preliminary rounds in 2005.

NPDA, according to Rogers (et al) also demonstrated above average participation percentages of white males, with a slightly greater disparity in the open division (with white males making up 51%, 49% and 55% of the field for the novice division and 57%, 63% and 61% of the field for the 1990, 1995 and 2000 seasons respectively).

CEDA demonstrated an even greater disparity. Evaluating the CEDA national tournament, Stepp and Gardner found that the percentage of male participants had dropped from 71% in 1990 to 64% in 2000. Stepp and Gardner summed up the results by noting that this "...is still not representative of the collegiate body in which women comprise 55.8% of students" (p.74). Furthermore, Rogers (et al) noted that during regular season competitions, the novice division is closer to representation of college enrollment (with 42%, 44% and 51% of the field being white male participants for the years 1990, 1995 and 2000 respectively). However, two disturbing trends are apparent in Rogers' (et al) data: 1) over the years 1990 to 2000 CEDA grew more homogenous (counter to the trend of other forensics organizations) and 2) there is a large disparity when looking to the open division (68%, 71% and 80% of the field being white male participants for the years 1990, 1995 and 2000 respectively).

NDT has demonstrated a positive trend toward equality; however the national tournament continues to have the greatest levels of inequality. Manchester and Friedley evaluated progress from the 1984 and 2001 national tournaments and found that while participation of female competitors marginally increased (female participation was 15% of the field in 1984 and 25% of the field in 2001), success for female competitors in elimination rounds actually decreased over the same timeframe. Furthermore, success rates in preliminary rounds also showed great disparity in the 2001 national tournament, as male competitors won 62% of their preliminary rounds, compared to female competitors who only won 35% of their preliminary rounds (Millsap and Millsap). Manchester and Friedley commented that "...these findings do provide powerful commentary on male/female parity within the primary outlet for policy debate – it simply does not exist" (p.32).

For IPDA, there is much less data available. Evaluating the 1998, 1999 and 2000 seasons, Rogers (et al) found that regular season participation for white male competitors remained slightly above 50% in the novice division (with annual participation rates of 55%, 49%, and 53% respectively) and also showed greater disparity with the participation of white male competitors in advanced divisions (with annual participation rates of 61%, 63% and 68% respectively).

This study seeks to shine more light upon the current status of racial and gender equality in IPDA debate. To that extent, the paper will test the following hypotheses in an attempt to determine if race and/or gender are predictors of competitive success, as well as evaluating participatory rates in the national tournament:

2007 National Tournament	46.2%	34.9%	15.4%	33.6%	28.8%	18.6%	10.3%	20.1%
2008 National Tournament	35.4%	47.2%	13.0%	34.7%	24.6%	27.8%	34.8%	27.4%
Totals 2007 + 2008 National Tournaments	40.2%	40.5%	14.5%	34.1%	26.5%	22.8%	19.4%	23.6%
National College Enrollment (US Census Bureau 2008)				56.9%				22.9%

H1a: That minority participation rates in the national tournament reflect a similar proportion of national college enrollment.

Hypothesis 1a is supported, with an overall minority representation within .7% of national enrollment averages. Data culled from census bureau statistics of average annual enrollment compared with this survey data indicate a relatively equal level of representation among racial demographic when simply comparing “minority” and “white, non-Hispanic” demographic participation (with 22.9% of enrolled college students representing a “minority” demographic and 23.6% of IPDA National Tournament entries representing a “minority” demographic). Additionally, evaluation of the two year cycle appears to indicate a progression toward greater representation of minority students in the organization. Not only did the minority participation rate grow from 20.1% in 2007 to 27.4% in 2008, but representation by competition division also became more representative of the general population (whereas 2007 showed a significant underrepresentation in varsity and open divisions, 2008 showed greater balance among the novice and varsity divisions, with the open division having the largest percentage of minority participants).

H1b: That female participation rates in the national tournament reflect a similar proportion of national college enrollment.

Hypothesis 1b is not supported, as disparity is present among gender representation not only in total participation, but at each level of competition. An initial observation is that women are most underrepresented in the Open division, with 15.4% and 13.0% total participation rates in the 2007 and 2008 national tournaments. This continues to illustrate the aforementioned problem noted by Rogers of participation levels dropping off in advanced levels of competition. This issue illustrates that the concern for the organization should be two-fold: recruitment of more women competitors as well as the retention of women competitors.

Hypothesis 2

Table 2: Participation Rates in Elimination Rounds compared with Preliminary Rounds at the IPDA National Championship Tournament

	Female				Minority			
	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total
2007 National Tournament - Prelim.	46.2%	34.9%	15.4%	33.6%	28.8%	18.6%	10.3%	20.1%

2007 National Tournament - Elim.	37.5%	12.5%	25.0%	25.0%	31.3%	12.5%	18.8%	20.8%
2008 National Tournament - Prelim.	35.4%	47.2%	13.0%	34.7%	24.6%	27.8%	34.8%	27.4%
2008 National Tournament - Elim.	34.4%	31.3%	12.5%	30.4%	15.6%	12.5%	25.0%	16.1%
Totals 2007 + 2008 National Tournaments - Prelim.	40.2%	40.5%	14.5%	34.1%	26.5%	22.8%	19.4%	23.6%
Totals 2007 + 2008 National Tournaments - Elim.	35.4%	21.9%	20.8%	27.9%	20.8%	12.5%	20.8%	18.3%

H2a: That minority participation rates in elimination rounds reflect a similar proportion of minority entry in the national tournament.

Hypothesis 2a is not supported. Comparing tournament entry percentages to those who qualified for the initial elimination round illustrates a disparity of representation (overall for 2007+2008, 23.6% of the tournament entry represented the “minority” demographic, yet only 18.3% of participation in the initial elimination round represented the “minority” demographic). Furthermore, all but two of the six divisions showed lesser participation rates in elimination rounds than in preliminary rounds (in 2007 the Novice and Open divisions had a greater proportion of minority competitors than were entered in the preliminary rounds).

H2b: That female participation rates in elimination rounds reflect a similar proportion of female entry in the national tournament.

Hypothesis 2b is not supported. Comparing tournament entry percentages to those who qualified for the initial elimination round illustrates a disparity of representation (overall for 2007+2008, 34.1% of the tournament entry represented the “female” demographic, yet only 27.9% of participation in the initial elimination round represented the “female” demographic). Furthermore, all but one of the six divisions showed lesser participation rates in elimination rounds than in preliminary rounds (the 2007 Open division had a greater proportion of female competitors than were entered in the preliminary rounds).

Hypothesis 3

Table 3: Average Speaker Points at the IPDA National Championship Tournament

	Male				Female			
	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total
2007 National Tournament Average Speaker Points	255.2	275.3	274.4	268.6	255.3	259.0	273.2	258.9
2008 National Tournament Average Speaker Points	245.6	277.6	260.5	256.8	247.0	264.7	269.7	255.6
2007 + 2008 Total Average Speaker Points	249.4	276.2	269.2	263.0	251.2	262.0	272.0	257.3

	White				Minority			
	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total
2007 National Tournament Average Speaker Points	253.4	271.8	274.1	266.2	259.7	260.2	275.9	262.3
2008 National Tournament Average Speaker Points	247.5	273.9	276.6	260.0	241.9	265.2	267.4	254.8
2007 + 2008 Total Average Speaker Points	250.0	272.7	274.8	263.3	250.5	263.0	270.2	258.1

H3a: That average speaker points are relatively constant among each racial demographic at the national tournament.

H3b: That average speaker points are relatively constant among each gender at the national tournament.

Neither hypothesis is supported, as both minorities and women received lower speaker points than white, non-Hispanic and men competitors, respectively. Comparing male to female speaker point averages, the data shows nearly 1 speaker point per round disparity (an average of 5.7 points less for females, per 8 round tournament). The data for women showed the greatest parity in the novice division (where women actually scored an average of 1.8 speaker points / 8 round tournament greater than men) and a slight advantage in the open division (where women scored an average of 2.8 points / 8 round tournament greater than men); however, in the varsity division the disparity was the greatest and female competitors were rated far lower than male competitors (14.2 points / 8 round tournament). When evaluating race as the control variable, the data shows an average of 5.2 points less per 8 round tournament assigned to minority competitors compared to white, non-Hispanic competitors. This disparity again illustrates the novice vs. advanced divisions discrepancy, as the novice division showed the greatest parity (with minority competitors receiving .5 points per 8 round tournament more than white competitors) and advanced divisions showing greater disparity (9.7 points less in varsity and 4.6 points less in open for minority competitors).

Hypothesis 4

Table 4: Average Number of Wins at the National Championship Tournament

	Preliminary Rounds							
	Male				Female			
	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total
2007 National Tournament Average Wins	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.9
2008 National Tournament Average Wins	4.1	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.7	4.0	3.9
2007 + 2008 Total Average Wins	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.9

	White				Minority			
	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total
2007 National Tournament Average Wins	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.5	4.3	3.9
2008 National Tournament Average Wins	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.8	3.2	3.6	3.6
2007 + 2008 Total Average Wins	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.3	3.8	3.7

		Elimination Rounds*							
		Male				Female			
		Novice	Varsity	Open	Total	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total
2007 National Tournament	Average Wins	1.0	1.1	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.5	1.0	0.8
2008 National Tournament	Average Wins	0.9	1.1	0.6	0.9	1.1	0.6	3.0	1.1
2007 + 2008 Total Average Wins		0.9	1.1	0.8	0.9	1.0	0.6	1.7	0.9

		White				Minority			
		Novice	Varsity	Open	Total	Novice	Varsity	Open	Total
2007 National Tournament	Average Wins	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.3	0.8
2008 National Tournament	Average Wins	1.0	0.3	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.7
2007 + 2008 Total Average Wins		1.0	0.6	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.4	0.7

* For elimination rounds, the number of wins indicates the average number of wins in the elimination rounds for a competitor advancing to elimination rounds.

H4a: That competitive success both in preliminary rounds and elimination rounds at the national tournament is relatively constant among each racial demographic.

H4b: That competitive success both in preliminary rounds and elimination rounds at the national tournament is relatively constant among each gender.

Neither hypothesis is supported. For preliminary rounds, both Female and Minority win ratio's demonstrated a minor disparity, with female competitors averaging 93% of the wins of their counterparts, and minority competitors averaging 88% of the wins of their counterparts. However, as noted with speaker points, the varsity division showed the greatest deviation from equal for female competitors, with varsity female competitors only averaging 84% of the wins of their counterparts. The varsity division also showed the greatest deviation from equal for minority competitors, who averaged only 77% of the wins of their counterparts. Furthermore, the average number of wins in preliminary rounds for minorities fell in all three divisions from 2007 to 2008, resulting in an average .3 fewer wins overall; if 2008 is indicative of a trend, this illustrates a departure from relative equality in preliminary round performance of 2007 (95%). For female competitors advancing to elimination rounds, the overall record of success reflects parity; however, significant disparities are present (with female competitors earning a slightly higher average number of wins in the novice division and a significantly higher average number of wins in the open division, yet only averaging 55% of the win totals of their counterparts in the varsity division). For minority competitors, the overall disparity became greater (dropping to an average of 78% of the win totals of their counterparts) and the open division showed the greatest disparity (with minority competitors averaging only 36% of the wins of their counterparts).

Hypothesis 5

Table 5: 2005-2007 Regular Season, Average Points per Tournament

Division	Male Competitors	Female Competitors	White Competitors	Minority Competitors
Novice	4.9	4.0	4.8	3.6

Varsity	4.8	3.8	4.4	4.4
Open	4.7	3.0	4.4	3.9
Total	4.8	3.8	4.6	3.9

H5a: That competitive success in the regular season is relatively constant among each racial demographic.

H5b: That competitive success in the regular season is relatively constant among each gender.

As with success at the national tournament, the regular season results indicate a disparity when comparing points per tournament (using the IPDA season long points formula for each tournament) when comparing competitor gender as well as when comparing competitor race. When evaluating male and female competitors, the competitive success gap grows when moving from the novice division toward more advanced divisions (.9 points per tournament for novice competitors, compared to 1.0 points and 1.7 points for varsity and open competitors). Race did not show as great of a disparity as gender; however, the results did indicate that minority competitors averaged only 85% of the points earned by their white counterparts (as opposed to 79% for female competitors compared to male competitors).

Hypothesis 6

Table 6: 2007 & 2008 National Tournaments – Average Number of Preliminary Round Wins and Speaker Points; Novice Division, Sorted by Number of Tournaments Experience

	Average Number of Wins				Average Speaker Points			
	Female	Male	Minority	White	Female	Male	Minority	White
0-25 Percentile Experience	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.2	238.5	239.8	233.5	241.9
26-50 Percentile Experience	3.4	4.5	4.1	4.1	242.2	245.4	245.3	243.8
51-75 Percentile Experience	4.4	3.6	4.0	4.1	257.2	252.9	265.8	250.4
76-100 Percentile Experience	5.1	4.9	4.2	5.1	265.0	261.0	262.7	262.4

H6a: That experience is a greater predictor of competitive success than race or gender at the national tournament.

H6b: That experience is a greater predictor of higher speaker points than race or gender at the national tournament.

For this data subset, only the novice division was analyzed because of difficulty verifying the number of tournaments that competitors from other divisions had previously entered (because of the potential of having competed in other formats of debate). Because the novice division is limited to competitors with less than 8 total tournaments of experience, and the verifiable number of tournaments that each competitor had entered in IPDA, the researchers were satisfied that the percentile analysis would be more accurate by just analyzing the novice division. The data illustrates a strong correlation between

experience and both the number of wins as well as the number of speaker points earned among each of the analyzed demographics. Contrasting female and male competitors, there are disparities in the win totals and speaker points, but those disparities flip from males having higher totals of each for both the 0-25 and 26-50 percentile range to females having higher totals in the 51-75 and 76-100 percentile range. However, consistent among both demographics (with the sole exception of win totals for males in the 51-75 range) is the progressive nature of both wins and speaker points as one becomes more experienced. Similarly, when comparing minority competitors with white competitors, the win totals are virtually identical for both the 26-50 and 51-75 percentiles, with minority competitors in the 0-25 range winning more frequently, and white competitors in the 76-100 range winning more frequently; likewise, in speaker points, minority competitors had higher averages in the 26-50 and 51-75 ranges, and white competitors had higher averages in the 0-25 range with the 76-100 range being identical. Similar to the gender analysis, evaluation of the racial demographics illustrate a relatively consistent increase of both wins and speaker points among competitors as their experience level increases (with the sole exception of the minor decrease in win totals among the 51-75 percentile and speaker points among the 76-100 percentile for minority competitors). For these reasons, experience correlates much stronger with both wins and speaker points than race and/or gender and thus the hypotheses are supported.

Discussion and Conclusion

While this format of debate is closer to representative of general collegiate enrollment, it still falls short of an effective representation of a diverse collegiate population, and the lack of diversity is exacerbated as one moves into the more advanced divisions. The data also illustrates that there is a very real disparity among competitive success rates of female and minority competitors; however, that disparity is not necessarily the result of an inherent bias within the format, but perhaps an issue of experience rates. Additional analysis of the data set indicated that the average male competitor in 2007-2008 competed in 5.7 tournaments, whereas the average female competitor competed in only 4.2; similarly, the average white competitor competed in 5.3 tournaments whereas the average minority competitor competed in 4.3. Thus, not only is there an underrepresentation of minorities and women, but they are also competing in fewer tournaments (which contributes to less competitive success). Accordingly, the charge for coaches, competitors and the organizational governance is to not only seek a more aggressive recruitment strategy, but also a more aggressive retention strategy. Additionally, the community needs to re-engage in the conversation about what different students want from the activity, what they like & dislike and what institutional factors may attract students to the activity or deter others from competing or continuing to compete. This format and organization has made progress from the historical disparities of intercollegiate debate as a whole, but continued evaluation is necessary to ensure future progress.

Furthermore, there is significant potential for future research. To more accurately evaluate the status of the organization's makeup, one can take a detailed survey of competitors at the start of a national tournament and chart their competitive success.

Additionally, more effective representation data can be gathered by comparing participant demographics with the demographics of the institutions they represent. Furthermore, the regular season data in this study utilized the IPDA points formula, combining preliminary round wins with points for advancing to elimination rounds and elimination round wins. A more exhaustive analysis would look to performance during individual tournaments separating preliminary rounds and elimination rounds and also evaluating speaker points during regular season competitions. Additionally, in an attempt to confirm the extrapolation from the tests of hypothesis 6, one could test the correlation between competitive success versus experience during regular season competitions as well. Finally, future analysis combining the test variables from this study (i.e. “white, non-Hispanic women,” “minority male,” etc.) could further help to clarify potential disparities as well as target demographics for future recruitment / retention efforts.

Sources

- Manchester, Bruce B. and Friedley, Sheryl A. “Revisiting Male/Female Participation and Success in Forensics: Has Time Changed the Playing Field?” *National Forensic Journal*, Vol. 21, Issue 2 (Fall 2003), pp. 20-35.
- Millsap, Susan and Millsap, Scott. “Gender Bias in NFA-LD: An Examination of Participation Rates and a Content Analysis of NFA-LD Ballots.” *National Forensic Journal*, Vol. 24, Issue 1 (Spring 2006), pp.61-68.
- Murphy, John M. “Separate and Unequal: Women in the Public Address Events.” *National Forensic Journal*, VII (Fall, 1989), pp. 115-125.
- Rogers, Jack. E.; Arthur Rennels, Chyanne Lockhart, Crystal McMillan, Adewale Soluade, and Obum Ukabam. “Interrogating the Myth to the ‘ISM’: An analysis of dominant and subdominant culturally linked perceptions and engendered motivations for continued participation in intercollegiate competitive debate.” *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta* 88 (Summer 2003): 1-26.
- Stepp, P.L. & Gardner, B. (2001). Ten years of demographics: Who debates in America. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 38(2), 69-82.
- US Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2008 online at: (last revised 6/28/08) <http://www.census.gov/prod/2007pubs/08statab/educ.pdf>

Peter Ramus: Significance in Rhetoric and Attacks on Cicero

Cole Franklin,
PhD, University of Southern Mississippi
East Texas Baptist University

Abstract

Peter Ramus is an influential figure in the field of rhetoric, education, theology, philosophy, and numerous other areas of study. Much of his influence and noteworthiness came not only from his personal propositions, but from his criticism of Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero.

This paper examines the propositions of Ramus, his writings, his popularity, his attacks on classical writers, and his influence on education, rhetoric, and dialectic. Also examined, is Ramus' criticism of Cicero and his reasoning behind the attack.

Introduction

Peter Ramus was born in the year 1515 as Pierre de la Rame´e in France. Little is known about Ramus' childhood and early life. What is known is that Ramus was one of the most dominating and influential figures in the history of rhetorical theory.

The reasoning behind Ramus' influence partially lies in the attacks and criticism that he leveled against some of the most prominent characters in the classics, including Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero. These attacks, specifically those against Cicero, are the basis for this paper. This paper will attempt to answer the question: Who was Peter Ramus and what was the basis for his rhetorical attacks on Cicero?

Before examining the attacks specifically, an understanding of Ramus' theories is necessary. What follows are overviews of Ramus' writings, his condemnation of Aristotle, his prohibition from teaching philosophy, his influence on the field of education, his stances on rhetoric and dialectic, and his popularity within Europe in the sixteenth century. Following an examination of Ramus, an overview of Cicero's influence on rhetoric, a comprehensive look at Ramus' specific attacks on Cicero will be covered.

Ramus' Writings

Most of Ramus' significant works were produced in a relatively short period of time (1543-1549) although many of them underwent several revisions. Sharratt (1976) does indicate that "in 1536 he defended an M.A. thesis on the subject 'Everything Aristotle said was false'" (p. 5). However, research done later by Ong and other authorities on Ramus has indicated that this title, in actuality, meant something different, although the basis of the thesis was a criticism of Aristotle.

Additionally, if Ramus did in fact write and defend the thesis under the alleged title, "because of the routine character of M.A. theses in general and of spectacular

sophisms in particular, Ramus himself and his contemporaries, almost to a man, attached no significance whatsoever to the event - despite his subsequent anti-Aristotelian career" (Sharratt, 1976, p. 7).

According to Murphy (1992), Ramus' writings fell into two categories: those confirming his own views and others in which he refuted or criticized the works and ideas of classical writers. His most prominent works include: *Dialecticae institutiones* (1543), *Institutiones oratoriae* (1545), *Institutiones dialecticae* (1543), *Aristotelicae animadversiones* (1543), *Brutinae quaestiones* (1547), and *Rhetoricae distinctiones in Quintilianum* (1549), the final three attacking Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian respectively. Ramus' writings were so prevalent in the sixteenth century that according to Ong (1958), there "are over 750 separately published editions (including some adaptations of single or collected works by Ramus or his collaborator Omer Talon...Counting separately each of the works in these 750-odd volumes...one gets a total of around 1,100 printings of individual works" (p. 5).

The Omer Talon referred to by Ong was a collaborator and supporter of Ramus and his attacks on classical writers. Talon was so supportive of Ramus that, following the 1544 royal prohibition placed upon Ramus' writings, Talon's name was placed on many publications that are suspected to be works of Ramus. In fact, Ramus' 1543 work *Dialecticicae institutiones*, "was published under the name of his colleague Omer Talon" (Murphy, 1992, p. xi).

Following 1549, Ramus' works were limited in scope focusing more on the subjects of education, military science, and mathematics, although he did publish the work *Ciceronianus* in 1555, urging the imitation of Cicero in career and style (Murphy, 1992).

Attacks on Classical Writers

Ramus was an individualist bent on change. This desire for change began while Ramus was still in school. In fact, Ramus felt that as a whole, his education had been a waste of his time. Huppert (1990), stated that "Ramus felt as though the studies he had undertaken through his education had been wasteful and unsatisfactory. He stated 'I reached the conclusion that all academic exercises had brought me nothing at all, only a waste of time'" (p. 211). His anger with the educational system in which he was a student was based on the study of classical writers such as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. Huppert (1990) went on to say that Ramus felt that the time spent studying these philosophers and the languages Greek and Latin could be much more beneficial being "invested instead, directly in the pursuit of knowledge" (p. 219). Huppert (1990) goes on to say that Ramus felt there were certain natural principles of thought that individuals possessed that enabled them to create what Ramus called intellectual "masterpieces" (p. 219).

Ramus was not one to subject himself to previous authorities willingly. Graves (1972) said that Ramus followed only those that naturally had the same values and beliefs that he held to be true. "He estimates the value even of those from whom he selects according to his fixed principles of subject matter" (p. 207).

Following Ramus' self-described wasteful education, he set out upon a mission to attack those he felt had let him down academically. Ramus, from the time of his M.A. thesis attacking Aristotle, began a methodical crusade against the influential works of Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero (Murphy, 1992). Even Ramus himself stated in his

Rhetoricae distinctiones in Quintilianum (Arguments in Rhetoric against Quintilian) "I have a single argument, a single subject matter, that the arts of dialectic and rhetoric have been confused by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian" (p. 563).

Ramus' primary focus of attack, and the attack on which most material has been written, is the one on Aristotle. Ramus saw Aristotle as being responsible for the combination of rhetoric and dialectic, which Ramus vehemently opposed (Ramus, 1992). Ramus felt that rhetoric and dialectic should be separated, a separation that will be discussed later in this paper.

Specifically, Ramus' goal in criticizing Aristotle was "threefold: to show how the Aristotelian-Scholastic logic as neither useful in practical spheres nor true and certain in its logic along lines he interpreted as Socratic; and to develop the art of judgment within that dialectic to replace both apodictic intuition and Aristotle's dialectic of practical wisdom with one comprehensive view of man's ability to think" (Walton, 1970, p. 153). In Ramus' (1992) words, he felt that Aristotle had "thrown the whole of dialectic into confusion; he has thrown rhetoric into confusion; he has also corrupted with his own calumnies the precepts which Plato fashioned through many holy admonitions" (p. 61).

Although Ramus held some level of respect for Cicero and Quintilian, his compliments for Aristotle were much less frequent. Ramus' complaints about Aristotle were reduced to a level of name-calling and extensive verbal attacks. In his attack on Cicero, Ramus blames Aristotle for Cicero's misguidings. He tells Cicero to "wake yourself up and observe the uselessness and the absurdity of Aristotle" (Murphy, 1992, p. xxviii). He continues to urge Cicero to "[C]ast away that deceitful, lying, vainglorious Aristotle. Do not call this man's foolish errors your own judgment" (Murphy, 1992, p. 50).

As a result of Ramus' perception of poor leadership on the part of Aristotle with regard to logic, rhetoric, and dialectic, he suggested a movement toward more of an individual manner of searching. He "concluded that we must turn from Aristotelian priorities and develop a logic more sensitive to our circumstances as variables among the things we explore and judge" (Walton, 1971, p. 292).

As vehement and extensive as Ramus' attack on Aristotle was with regard to rhetoric and dialectic, there is a school of thought that believes Ramus' criticism was religiously based. Irwin (1941) points to the high esteem with which Ramus was held in England during a growth period for Puritanism. He goes on to say that Ramus' "attacks on Aristotelianism were regarded for what they were, attacks on the Roman Church. Twenty years after his death he was revered as a Protestant martyr by many Cambridge scholars" (p. 16).

While Ramus criticized highly held individuals such as Socrates, Aristotle, Quintilian and Cicero, he himself did hold some regard for the philosophers and rhetoricians. Walton (1970), points out that "there is evidence that Ramus followed a number of leads he believed to be Socrates' views, and he worked from them by questioning and proposing" (p. 155). Even with the vicious names that Ramus equated with Aristotle, he did, in his *Arguments in Rhetoric Against Quintilian*, admit that Aristotle "had an amazing fecundity of talent" (Bizzell & Herzberg, 1990, p. 564). Likewise, Graves (1972), pointed out that of Ramus' great teachers "the greatest master of Ramus was Aristotle himself, whom in the medieval form he so bitterly opposed....[h]is logic and spirit were based upon those of the great Stagyrte, when properly

comprehended. Undoubtedly, too, Ramus owed much, as he frankly confesses to Socrates, Plato, Galen, and the Stoics, and even to Cicero and Quintilian" (pp. 17-18).

Ramus' Prohibition

Ramus' attacks on the classical writers, philosophers, and rhetoricians did not go unnoticed. Because his criticism was not only an attack on Aristotle, but an attack on the established rules of European education, "Ramus was condemned first by the faculty of theology...then by the Parlement....[t]he matter was finally referred to Francois Ier" (king) "himself and a public debate...was organized, in the presence of senior representatives of all the faculties" (Sharratt, 1976, p. 6). As a result of the meetings, Ramus was prohibited from teaching philosophy and dialectic throughout France. Additionally, Ramus' books were banned and continued printing of his works were prohibited. The government would not allow the supremacy of Aristotle to be challenged by Ramus or anyone else.

His prohibition was not however simply upheld in France. Huppert (1990) states that regardless of his continued attempts to gain teaching positions, Ramus' applications were consistently rejected throughout Europe including Switzerland and Germany.

Ramus however, would not be shaken. He took his punishment and prohibition just as it was handed down, a prohibition from teaching philosophy and dialectic. Ramus "was content to say that philosophy was synonymous with logic, and that was all he was not allowed to teach" (Sharratt, 1976, p. 6). Ramus was a man that was determined to separate and categorize fields of study. He saw each area of knowledge as being distinct and apart from all others. "Yet the method for explaining each art is identical and they have a common purpose in the presentation of knowledge. His colleague Talon would teach philosophy, that is logic, in the morning, and he would teach rhetoric in the afternoon" (Sharratt, 1976, p. 7), for rhetoric was distinct and separate from the art of dialectic.

Ramus' prohibition was short-lived, because in 1545, the Dauphin Henry, a friend and supporter of Ramus, was named King Henry II (Murphy, 1992) and subsequently reinstated Ramus. He was not vindicated in totality however as he was still required "to explain the regular authors in the way prescribed by the statutes. He was permitted upon holidays, feast days, Sundays, and such hours were left open by the rules, to teach whatever authors he chose and as freely as he liked. This likened to giving him nearly two-thirds of the year to interpret as he wished" (Graves, 1972, p. 46).

Six years later, in 1551, Ramus was named Professor of Philosophy and Eloquence at the College Royale, a title that none had held before him and none held following his departure (Sharratt, 1976).

Following his *Arguments in Rhetoric Against Quintilian*, written in 1549, Ramus concentrated on opposing his contemporary educators as opposed to the classics. He wrote on the subjects of mathematics and religion among others. In 1561, Ramus became a Protestant and on "August 26, 1572, he was attacked by three men in his college chambers, shot, stabbed, and thrown out a fifth story window. His headless body was thrown into the Seine" (Murphy, 1992, p. xiv).

Although Ramus was the first to be censored for teaching philosophies in opposition to Aristotle, he was not the last. Likewise, his punishment was not the most extreme imposed on reformers. Huppert (1990), stated that in "1624, long after Ramus had been murdered...the doctors of the theology faculty went beyond censorship: they

requested and obtained a court order providing the death penalty for anyone foolhardy enough to criticize Aristotle" (p.211).

Role in Education

As stated earlier in this paper, Ramus had a view that all areas of study and fields of inquiry should be separated from each other. He was famous for "separating a whole into two or three major divisions, and of proceeding systematically to break those divisions up into parts, and those parts into subparts, until only indivisible units remained" (Howell, 1971, p. 454). However, Ramus' influence in education extended far beyond a separation of fields of study. Yates (1966) stated that "[O]f all the reformers of educational methods in the sixteenth century the most prominent, or the most self-advertised, was Pierre de la Ramee, more generally known as Peter Ramus" (p. 231).

Why was Ramus so noteworthy with regard to education? Grafton and Jardine (1986) indicate that the reasoning is twofold. First, Ramus was the first educational reformer to truly challenge Aristotle as an authority. Secondly, Ramus "advocated the union for teaching purposes of philosophy and eloquence" (p. 162). They go on to suggest the significance of Ramus' "institutional" nature of educational reform. He "deliberately discarded the difficulty and rigour of high scholastic schooling and thereby attracted those who regarded education as a means to social position rather than as a preparation for a life of scholarship....In doing so he explicitly...achieved the final secularisation of humanist teaching - that transition from 'humanism' to 'the humanities'" (p. 168).

Ramus' role in education was so significant that he literally developed his own timetable for college courses and course structure. According to Sharratt, (1976), Ramus felt that students between the ages of seven and fifteen should be taught for ten hours each day. The courses taught were classical literature, memorizing, and debate. During the first three years of study, students would focus on grammar and syntax. The fourth year would focus on rhetoric, the fifth on logic, "ethics in the sixth...and mathematics, that is arithmetic and geometry, music and optics. The final year is devoted to physics...included meteorology and some astronomy" (p. 7).

Another departure Ramus made from the more traditional philosophy of education was his philosophy regarding the moral nature of education. Whereas educators prior to Ramus wanted to ensure that students were trained to become "good people" as well as scholars. According to Ramus "the purpose of education was to purvey information and skills, not to be morally improving: Ramist teaching might make you a good grammarian or a good mathematician; there was no guarantee that it would make you a good person" (Grafton & Jardine, 1986, p. 170). Ironically, Ramus' literature was "used and preferred for use in the schools for younger students" (Freedman, 1993, p. 140), a time at which modern education emphasizes character building and good citizenship.

Ramus' influence particularly extended to the Puritan education of the sixteenth century. According to Adams (1990), Ramus "played a role in inculcating students with political and social values consistent with the interests of Puritan educators" (p. 562). However, Puritan educators did not agree with all of Ramus' methods and techniques. Between 1570 and 1620, Puritan education replaced many of the "pagan" illustrations in Ramus' *Dialectic* with illustrations from the Bible (Adams, 1990).

Ramus felt that his educational methods were superior to other existing methods in the sixteenth century. In fact, Ramus felt that his educational methods could not only impart knowledge to students but in fact "culminate in the individual's realization of God's logic...to know and act in imitation of the way he knows and acts. Ramus gradually developed this view to the point of considering philosophy as the way to develop 'man's divinity'" (Walton, 1970, p. 159).

Ramus on Rhetoric

Ramus is most recognized not for his contributions to education, but rather for the impact he had on the study of rhetoric. It has been stated that Ramus was very interested in separating arts and fields of study. Whereas previous rhetoricians had combined rhetoric and dialectic, Ramus refused to acknowledge the relationship of the two. Ramus defined rhetoric as "the theory of writing well and speaking well, or pleading or speaking eloquently....Rhetoric teaches how to speak elegantly from tropes and figures" (Murphy, 1992, p. 63). Bizzell and Herzberg, (1990), continued to say that Ramus thought of rhetoric as "style and delivery alone" (p. 560) whereas logic is thought of by Ramus as the process of arguing appropriately (Howell, 1971).

Irwin (1941) went on to state that to Ramus "invention, disposition, and memory belonged to logic; and that elocution or style and delivery or pronunciation were the properties of rhetoric. Logic invented arguments and arranged them in methodical order for the convenience of the memory; rhetoric then decided on the best means of persuading the audience within the logic she unfolded. Rhetoric's medium or persuasion was style, pronunciation, and gesture, but the content of the argument she offered was logic" (p. 16).

This separation was once again, in Ramus' tradition, contrary to the beliefs of the classical writers. Ramus separated all possible relationships with rhetoric from the art specifically. "It seemed fallacious to him to combine rhetoric with grammar, as suggested by Quintilian, and he held it confusing to insist, with Cicero, that dialectic, philosophy, ethics, and various other subjects are essential to the orator as such. These matters, while improving to him as a man, have nothing to do with his rhetorical training. For rhetoric it is necessary only to know the rules of the art of speech so as to use them effectively, in the same way that grammar consists in the use of correct language" (Graves, 1972, p. 135).

Ramus did however admit an approval of Cicero's division of speech into the aspects of style and delivery. He said to Cicero in his *The Questions of Brutus*, "You argue very well and are keenly involved....Style is a general name meaning tropes and figures and the entire ornament of diction; it even covers delivery, as you say, and in fact covers and signifies much more than diction itself" (Murphy, 1992, p. 63). Walton (1970) indicates that Ramus did not reduce rhetoric as some would claim. He states that those that make this claim "fail to account for all three phases of Ramus' dialectic and for the systematic relationships between them" (p. 155). Walton points out that Ramus saw rhetoric not just as a method of persuading individuals, but as something deeper that assists individuals in "evaluating inter-relationships between discoveries" (p. 155).

Ramus' Popularity

As a result of his variations from the classics and reformist ideas, Ramus was seen as an extremist. By taking on this role, he gained a great number of supporters as well as a wide range of opposition. Murphy (1992) illustrates the extent of those with an opinion

on Ramus when he indicates that "in the *Ramus and Talon Inventory* of Walter Ong, it takes twenty-four pages...simply to list the authors for or against Ramus" (p. ix).

Howell (1971) illustrates this diversity of opinions by discussing the opinions expressed by Thomas Reid regarding Ramus and his stances. Reid suggested at one point that Ramus was literally "a force of genius sufficient to shake the Aristotelian fabric" (p. 382). Later, Reid downplays the significance of Ramus' attacks on Aristotle as being "more specious than useful" (p. 382). Reid saw Ramus' goals as being deceitful and showy in nature as opposed to having real application.

Freedman (1993) identifies two essential reasons that Ramus was popular, specifically in the period between 1570 and 1630. First, Ramus' message on logic and rhetoric were simple and easy to understand. Secondly, his books and methods were directed toward younger students and these were the demographic group that most supported Ramus.

Following 1630, however, Ramus' works lost popularity in Europe. Freedman (1993) also offers two reasons for the decline in Ramus' notoriety. The initial reasoning was the fact that schools were moving toward teaching all aspects of philosophy. The "instruction in grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, and geometry was emphasized" (p. 141). Secondly, Freedman points to the issue that the works of Ramus simply did not have the longevity of the works of authors like Aristotle, Cicero, and Seneca. The excitement over Ramus' philosophy and works simply declined over time.

Cicero's Influence in Rhetoric

One reason Cicero was chosen as a basis for attack by Ramus was the influence that Cicero carried with him in the history of rhetorical theory. Rolfe (1963) indicated that Cicero was very influential in the schools of rhetoric. He, in fact, represented "sometimes a perfect character" (p. 110). He was a perfect model for rhetoricians and was frequently equated with the term eloquence. "Cicero is no longer the name of a man, but has become a synonym for eloquence" (Rolfe, 1963, p. 112). Higgenbotham (1967) went on to say that Cicero's extent of influence extended throughout the renaissance. He states that Cicero "was a dominant influence on the chief figure in this movement" (p. 25).

Cicero's influence was at a height when Ramus began his studies in the 1520's. Lectures on Cicero were a routine part of university life; younger schoolboys as well were exposed to Cicero through their study of his rhetorical precepts, and through systematic commentaries on his orations and letters" (Murphy, 1992, p. xv).

There is a problem with Cicero's rhetoric which served as part of a basis for Ramus' attack. As Bizzell and Herzberg (1990) discuss, "Cicero does not show the speakers developing and modifying their positions in the course of the debate. Hence it is difficult to point to any passage as a concise statement of Cicero's rhetorical theory" (p. 197).

Also interesting with regard to Cicero is the level of interest, regardless of the extent of respect he carried in rhetoric, that he had in rhetoric. It was not, according to Bizzell and Herzberg (1990), his first priority. "Cicero's courtroom gave him more satisfaction than his early writing on rhetoric did" (p. 195).

Ramus' Attacks on Cicero

Ramus' attacks on Cicero came in the form of a response to one of Cicero's works, possibly his most noteworthy and thorough work, that of *Orator*. "*Orator*, written in late

46 B.C....takes the form of a letter to Cicero's friend Marcus Junius Brutus in response to Brutus' request that Cicero describe the Ideal Orator" (Murphy, 1992, p. xi). By responding to Cicero's comments in the same format as they were recorded, Ramus is able to express his opinions as the character of Brutus rather than as himself. He takes on the character of Brutus as if he were responding to Cicero's original statements. Murphy (1992) also points to the fact that as *Orator* focuses on style and Ramus is interested in delivery and style, it was the ideal choice for his attacks. Also, during the sixteenth century, there was great debate over what was referred to as "Ciceronianism". The choice by Ramus to use Cicero's *Orator* as a basis for attack enabled him to "enter into the widespread controversy" (Murphy, 1992, p. xxv).

Murphy (1992) identified all of the fronts which Ramus criticizes with regard to Cicero and his precepts in *Orator*. They are:

Cicero has no theory, Cicero's errors in *Orator* are the same as the errors in his other books, Cicero has no real description of the true orator, Cicero admits he is a victim of the Asiatics yet continues to follow them, Cicero makes Style alone proper to the orator, Cicero does not understand Invention through the Topics or through the Questions of Stasis, Cicero does not understand that Syllogism is a part of Arrangement, Cicero's concept of the Five Parts of Rhetoric is false, Cicero does not understand that Decorum belongs to Dialectic rather than Rhetoric, Cicero does not understand the Figures and Tropes, Cicero does not understand that rhythm is 'a measured arrangement of speech', Cicero would be a better man if he followed nature rather than false authorities (p. xxxi).

Each of these issues will not be addressed. Only some of the larger, more pertinent factors will be discussed in this paper. In totality, Ramus not only addressed minute details of Cicero's works, but also discussed cultural issues extending to the "proper role of a writer in society" (Murphy, 1992, p. xviii).

The issues of Ramus' attack that will be discussed below are: Cicero's lack of theory, his discussions of rhetoric in general, his definition of an orator, his discussion of syllogisms and arguments, and the figures to blame for misleading Cicero - his teachers.

As most researchers agree, it is necessary to utilize a theoretical basis for propositions and discussions. Ramus felt that Cicero, though he held positive propositions, lacked the necessary theoretical basis for them. On the purposes of speaking: to teach, to delight, and to move, Ramus asks "what theory do you expound for so many arts?...how do you make these skills and methods clear?...shouldn't the qualities of body and mind and their parts be clarified in detail to satisfy the proposition and make human nature clear and accurate" (Murphy, 1992, p. 12)?

One of the issues Ramus is most noted for is his discussion of and definition of rhetoric. According to Howell (1961), Ramus had a specific "conception of the way in which the five parts of Ciceronian rhetoric should be detached from their traditional surroundings and redistributed between rhetoric and dialectic" (p. 248). While Cicero separated the parts of a speech into the parts of invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery, Ramus felt that only rhetoric was necessary. "Is not the whole of rhetoric though confused by the five parts, common to all questions (Murphy, 1992, p. 60). He went on to say that "because you scorn memory as common, you must by the same reasoning scorn invention, arrangement, style, and delivery, since they are all alike common to all things" (p. 61).

Ramus spends the majority of his criticism of Cicero on the topic of their differing definitions of an orator and the questions that an orator should answer. While both agree on the use of a grand style of delivery. Ramus wrote to Cicero "I do not oppose you here....because the audience is generally dull and slow-witted, like a bad horse which does nothing unless spurred, I confess that grandeur and majesty of speech are necessary" (Murphy, 1992, p. 10).

Cicero wrote that the orator is limited in scope only to style and delivery. He also describes orators as good men. Ramus felt that Cicero's definition was lacking. He believed that Cicero was "describing not a common orator, but a most rounded and highly learned man, conversant in all the arts....You wish to fashion a political being, complete in every way; in naming this man an orator, you are seriously wrong" (Murphy, 1992, p. 24).

In Ramus' point of view, Cicero digressed seriously in his definition of an orator. Ramus states in his attack that Cicero's definition of an orator digresses in that it does not equate with the definitions of past orators of Greece and Rome and that Cicero's definition ignores the significance of the epideictic style (Murphy, 1992).

Ramus also claims that Cicero's questions for an orator to answer are flawed. Cicero believed that an orator, in presentations should answer the questions "Whether it was done?", "What was done?", and "What was its nature?". In Ramus' point of view, these questions are not necessary. According to Ramus, "I ask, 'where is it?', 'when will it come?', 'where is it going?', 'how many parts does it have?', 'of what is it made?', 'why is it?', my inquiry makes no use of any of your three" (Murphy, 1992, p. 45).

A fourth major criticism that Ramus has of Cicero is his discussion of arguments. In his *Arguments in Rhetoric Against Quintilian*, Ramus states that "Cicero has no statement of fact which does not lay down arguments and reasons for the subjects and which does not apply syllogisms and argumentations" (Ramus, 1549, p. 576). While Ramus felt that Cicero ignored syllogisms in the arrangement of arguments, Ramus claimed that "arrangement is twofold: one concerns individual arguments, and another concerns complex arguments. The former uses syllogisms for judging every subject, the latter uses method for clearer understanding....From the theory of syllogisms dialectic teaches us the rule for applying the most sound and consistent judgment so that we may determine which things are true and which things are false, that is which are truly good, evil, useful, useless, noble, disgraceful, just unjust, desirable, undesirable, sound and unsound, or, on the other hand, which are falsely said to have such qualities" (Murphy, 1992, p. 52).

As opposed to his attacks on Quintilian and Aristotle, Ramus, in his criticism of Cicero, does not blame Cicero himself for his false beliefs and incorrect propositions. Ramus does not blame Cicero personally, but rather blames his teachers and their poor direction of Cicero for his lack of a "correct" understanding of his topics. He advises Cicero to return to nature for guidance rather than looking to his teachers of the past. Ramus felt that Cicero's incorrect perceptions did not "derive from your critical thinking, rather I truly believe that they derive from Aristotle and from the schools of the other rhetoricians whom you consider here your mentors....O Marcus Cicero, you would have been a thoroughly excellent and admirable man if you had followed nature as your leader rather than the opinion of many men" (Murphy, 1992, p. 136). Ramus blames "Aristotle

for confusing the principles of invention, then adds that 'Cicero and Quintilian on the authority of Aristotle lapse into the same confusion'" (Murphy, 1992, p. xviii).

Ramus' Admiration of Cicero

As vehemently as Ramus attacked Cicero and his propositions and though he wrote extensively on Cicero (Murphy, 1992), he did not oppose Cicero on all fronts. In fact, Ramus held great admiration for Cicero in some areas. For example, Ramus believed that Cicero was a superb logician and he admired Cicero's speeches and his technique of combining logic with oratory (Murphy, 1992). While Ramus was a proponent of imitating other speakers, his emphasis on imitation was extended with regard to Cicero. Ramus advocated students imitation of Cicero's "resources of wisdom and character" (Adams, 1990, p. 558). Ramus felt that orators should strive to be like Cicero, not only with regard to style, but also follow and imitate "his prudence, his knowledge of things, and his virtues" (Murphy, 1992, p. xxiv). In fact, Ramus said that the imitation of just one of Cicero's speeches would "bear valuable fruit" (Murphy, 1992, p. xxiv).

Ramus not only encouraged others to imitate and follow Cicero's style, virtues, and knowledge, but Ramus himself drew particular themes from Cicero and endorsed them. Two themes in particular that Ramus extracted from Cicero and advocated were those of a "natural moral order" and a "will of the people" (Adams, 1990, p. 566).

The theme of a natural moral order implies that there is a bond between people and food. Ramus purports that things are not simply created, but rather they are a part of nature.

The second theme of the will of the people emphasizes that people "have a right to position...consistent with Puritan interests" (Adams, 1990, p. 566). As was stated earlier in this paper, Ramus was a major force in Puritan education. His support of this theme was part of that force that he had in the Puritan movement.

Conclusion

A question that must be asked after Ramus' vehement attacks against Cicero is how could Ramus both admire and attack Cicero? The answer comes from Murphy (1992) in that Ramus "blamed all of Cicero's faults on his teachers and assigning all his virtues to Cicero himself" (p. xxix). Ramus said that "[T]hose very few things of which some of us do not approve, are entirely from your teachers" (Murphy, 1992, p. xxix).

Although Ramus attacks the beliefs and propositions of Cicero in much the same ways that he attacked Aristotle and Quintilian there are differences in Ramus' methods against Cicero and his criticisms of others. Whereas, in his attacks against Aristotle and Quintilian, Ramus made his criticisms directly, in those against Cicero, Ramus took on the character of another. It appears that Ramus did not wish to criticize Cicero directly even though Cicero died almost 1600 years earlier.

Also, Ramus did not place the blame for Cicero's beliefs squarely on his shoulders as he did when criticizing Aristotle and Quintilian. Instead, Ramus took the opportunity to again attack Aristotle through Cicero. He found fault with Cicero, but seemingly made a point to stress the fact that Cicero was not to be held accountable for his shortcomings as Ramus saw them. Cicero was merely an unsuspecting follower of Aristotle. Ramus felt Cicero was simply naive in believing Aristotle. Cicero's faults were not seen as being of his own making. Rather, they resulted from his belief in Aristotle, an individual that Ramus saw as having excessive faults.

Bibliography

- Adams, J.C. (1990). Gabriel Harvey's Ciceronianus and the place of Peter Ramus' Dialecticae libri duo in the curriculum. *Renaissance Quarterly*, 43, 551-569.
- Bizzell, P., & Herzberg, B. (Eds.). (1990). *The Rhetorical Tradition*. Boston: Bedford Books.
- Freedman, J.S. (1993). The diffusion of the writings of Petrus Ramus in central Europe, c. 1570-1630. *Renaissance Quarterly*, 46, 98-152.
- Grafton, A & Jardine, L. (1986). *From humanism to the humanities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Graves, F.P. (1972). *Peter Ramus and the educational reformation of the sixteenth century*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms.
- Higginbotham, J. (1967). *Cicero on moral obligation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Howell, W.S. (1971). *Eighteenth century British logic and rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Howell, W.S. (1961). *Logic and rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*. New York, NY: Russell & Russell, Inc.
- Huppert, G. (1990). Peter Ramus: the humanist as Philosophe. *Modern Language Quarterly*, 51, 208-223.
- Irwin, F. (1941). *Ramistic logic in Milton's prose works*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms.
- Murphy, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Peter Ramus's attack on Cicero: Text and translation of Ramus's Brutinae Quaestiones* (C. Newlands, Trans.). Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press.
- Ong, W. (1958). *Ramus, method, and the decay of dialogue*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ramus, P. (1549). Arguments in rhetoric against Quintilian. In P. Bizzell & B. Herzberg (Eds.). *The Rhetorical tradition* (pp. 563-583). Boston: Bedford Books.
- Rolfe, J.C. (1963). *Cicero and his influence*. New York, NY: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc.
- Sharratt, P. (1976). Peter Ramus and the reform of the university: the divorce of philosophy and eloquence. In P. Sharratt (Ed.). *French Renaissance Studies 1540-1570* (pp. 4-20). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Walton, C. (1970). Ramus and the art of judgment. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 3, 152-164.
- Yates, F.A. (1966). *The art of memory*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Resolution of Risk

Robert "Rob" Redding Jr.
University of Louisiana at Monroe

Resolutions in argumentation have typically been interpreted as either being fact, value or policy. The aforementioned approaches assume that rhetors must argue along only three rigid tracks. However, neo-rhetors - those who are now debating fact resolutions and other topics - are rarely analyzing propositions as simple as, "War is bad." Fact resolutions typically are currently going further, stating a certain "war is bad." These new propositions bring about the question, "Is there a greater risk of stopping the war versus continuing the war?" What's more, typically there is an implied risk in these so called fact resolutions that is something unstated or left to be proven. These so called policy and value resolutions follow this same line of implied logic when they ask if we "should" do something or suggest that one need is greater than another.

What's more, neo-rhetors on the affirmative and negative face off armed with a topic that is built around a problem, policy or point that the framers of the resolution, and maybe even the critic have in mind: A certain war is bad? We should not be in this war? Life is more important than power? All of these aforementioned questions and statements place a burden on the neo-rhetors in varying debate formats to meet and exceed expectations. Randy Barnett said the framers are wardens, designers and architects. [1] Meanwhile, The Rostrum firmly establishes the critic or judge as an "army of one." [2] Combining the approach of the judge and the framer means that not meeting the expectations of the two may be a mistake that could cost the neo-rhetor the round of competition. It is also core to argumentation to use logos to meet and exceed a critic's expectation. [3]

This paper explores how applying a more critical theory to resolutions can better debate through evaluating propositions as Resolutions of Risk. A Resolution of Risk, is any proposition that assumes an implied risk that is good or bad to individuals, groups, organizations or countries. In some forms of debate, these resolutions are typically more hybrid fact/policy resolutions, with a compound predictive function - or an element of an implied risk. These resolutions, which often do not contain the word should, assume some imminent policy - and sometimes individual action - that has not been accepted as fact. This paper discusses how neo-rhetors, who are advocating on the affirmative or negative, may approach these trends in debate and how to argue Resolutions of Risk in the growing world of the International Public Debate Association.

I. The Affirmative

The affirmative, those who advocate for change, have always had real challenges as it relates to winning a critics ballot. From the moment the neo-rhetor is handed the topic, their first thought must and should be, "What did the framers intend and what can I do to win the competition?" The very nature of debate is that a critic ultimately determines what is 'factual' based on the strength of one's advocacy. It is true, the Affirmative has many burdens: topicality, solvency, significance, harms and inherency. Still, before all of the aforementioned burdens must come adherence to the framers intent. Clearly stated, for the affirmative to win the round the message that they are sending is one that must be connected in some way to the resolution, which goes beyond topicality

and enters the realm of logoi. Resolution of Risk analysis is argumentation at its core. Argumentation or logic has always worked along with topicality in its importance, because if the preconditions of the framers and critics are not met prior to reading the completed plan in the round, there may be a loss of logoi. This is debatably why more cases pass the topicality threshold. These neo-rhetors have moved the debate forward in the mind of the critic and framer.

Thus, the neo-rhetor can establish strong logoi and build ethos and pathos by making sure that the proper way of arguing is selected or advanced beyond the topic. Again, fact resolutions rarely state, "War is good." War-focused resolutions typically state that a specific war is good so it is incumbent on the neo-rhetor to make sure they cover the angle that began the war in the first place. It is also imperative that the affirmative make sure that they approach policy in the same way. In short, they must make sure they solve policy resolutions and not make matters worse. What's more, value resolutions must be evaluated from what brought the framer to write, "Love is greater than war." Affirmatives should ask, "What is the risk of love over war or war over love?" All of the angles of a resolution must be satisfied in a critical analysis of all of the possible problems and solutions of any plan - if one is to be presented - beforehand. The biggest voting issue in a competition is often when there is a disconnect between the critical and the competitors, because the critic feels as if points are not properly understood or explained.

II. The Negative

Resolution of Risk provides negative neo-rhetors with an additional argument. Kritiks, counterplans and spec arguments are more recent ways of challenging affirmatives arguments - but only after affirmatives have met the fundamental burdens of the resolution. In contrast, the Resolution of Risk approach to debate offers a more critical analysis in argumentation.

Resolution of Risk for the negative, is about challenging the opposition's logoi. The very approach to the traditional fact, policy, or value approach is under scrutiny. What's more, the methods used within the affirmatives argumentation - which may include solvency, significance, harms - are all in question.

In the "War is bad" example, the first argument, for negatives using the Resolution of Risk, is that this is not yet a fact. If the proposition says that the country should not enter this certain war, from a policy perspective, then the question becomes, "What are the risk that we are actually going to enter the war?" or arguing that not entering the war may actually make things worse. If a value is being upheld then Resolution of Risk can challenge the value as being what the risk of the said value will be compromised. The aforementioned approach offers deeper theoretical arguments to the proposition and also question the traditional approach to taking the proposition as being fact, policy, or value based. What's more, these types of arguments can become winning issues when they are impacted properly.

During a review of this paper's concept for publication, Bossier Parish Community College Director of Forensics Bob Alexander wrote: "From a negative perspective, the resolution of risk provides an additional avenue of attack. In addition to traditional value hierarchy attacks upon the assumptions of advocacy and the disadvantage, counterplan, etc. levels of attack upon policy advocacy, the negative now has the opportunity to question whether the risk is significant enough. In questioning

whether the risk is sufficient enough, the negative is not placed into a scenario of defending the status quo or counterplanning, but instead has the opportunity to recognize that a problem may exist but that the risk of harm (i.e. 'impending economic collapse') is not significant enough to justify adoption of a policy framework without specific policy analysis (i.e. 'we should not adopt a \$700 billion blank check, but instead should consider multiple direct packages')."

There are also other implications that the Resolutions of Risk points out, as it relates to the International Public Debate Association community. IPDA's hybrid resolutions are asking questions that are not policy or not yet fact before lay judges who can be given real world lessons in argumentation by the neo-rhetor. The argument being that the affirmative addressing the proposition as a Resolutions of Risk is mandatory because there are certain implied issues raised by the framer that must be addressed to uphold logos in the round.

III. How to argue a Risk Resolution, when faced with hybrid fact/policy propositions?

In IPDA, Resolutions of Risk are sometimes hybrid fact/policy resolutions, with a compound predictive function - or an element of an implied risk. These resolutions, which do not contain the word should, assume some imminent policy - and sometimes individual action - that has not been accepted as fact.

Before we go further lets define some terms:

Imminent: Close in time; about to occur; "retribution is at hand"; "some people believe the day of judgment is close at hand"; "in imminent danger"; "his impending retirement." [4]

Policy: A line of argument rationalizing the course of action of a government; "they debated the policy or impolicy of the proposed legislation." [5]

Fact: A piece of information about circumstances that exist or events that have occurred. [6]

What's more, these IPDA Resolutions of Risk use words like "will" or "won't"; "has" or "hasn't"; "can" or "cannot," when none of these have happened yet. These Resolutions of Risk are only looming, theorized or reported. They are, or may be, imminent and are not yet policy or fact. They are based on pure speculation.

Here are a few examples of past IPDA topics and suggestions of how to apply Resolutions of Risk:

Example 1:

"Universal health care will cause the Democrats to lose."

This resolution appeared at an International Public Debate Association tournament in the fall of 2007. Some IPDA affirmatives were forced to argue the risk that is implied based on current policy. Debaters could either say this is a good or bad thing and argue the harms and or advantages that result.

Affirmative arguments:

Step 1: They would label the proposition as a Resolution of Risk and attempt to prove that the Democrats will lose due to Universal Health Care.

Step 2: They would then have to appeal to the judge to vote for them and to reject any risk of the stated implied harms or advantages as a result of that loss – thus adhering to the framer's intent.

Negative argument:

The negative would have to counter the core resolution by stating that this is a Resolutions of Risk and charge the affirmative with not using proper logos and violating the framer's intent. With the type of resolution that is being debated firmly established, the negative would then seek to prove that other things may be more of a risk to the Democrats losing.

Example 2:

Affirmative arguments:

The Resolutions of Risk is just as useful when referring to a person. This is evidenced by a second resolution taken from the same tournament:

"T.O. is going to be KO'd this year."

Step 1: They would label the proposition as a Resolution of Risk and prove that the T.O. will get "KO'd."

Step 2: They would then have to appeal to the judge to vote for them and reject any risk of the implied harms or advantages as a result of that outcome – again adhering to the framer's intent.

Negative argument:

The negative would have to counter the core resolution by stating that this is a Resolutions of Risk and charge the affirmative with not using proper logos and violating the framer's intent. With the type of resolution that is being debated firmly established, the negative would then seek to counter that other things lead to the players losing.

In conclusion, resolutions in argumentation have typically been interpreted as either being fact, value or policy. As the entire debate community increasingly engages more complex resolutions, neo-rehetors will continue to look for more innovative ways to argue. The Resolution of Risk approach provides a more critical analysis of these complex propositions while improving the level of argumentation, and providing serious potential for future development of the theory. In closing, the Resolution of Risk puts the entire debate community on a path back to logic and presents an opportunity for the community to rethink traditional approaches.

Preparing Students for Future Careers

Jean Eldred, PhD

Communication Studies Program

Stephen F. Austin State University

No matter what course I teach or what extra-curricular activity I serve as faculty sponsor for my underlying concern is, “In what way will this benefit my students in their future careers and lives?” Certainly, there is specific information I wish to impart in a given course, but the bottom line is what usefulness does the course have for the student in the future. In this way I suppose I am a pragmatist and a utilitarian and some might drum me out of the Academy. I now bring this perspective to my examination of debate.

I spent many years as a judge in NDT and CEDA debate circles, and I confess I at first approached the notion of IPDA debate with a bit of an elitist attitude – I already *knew* what real debate was! Real debate was NDT and CEDA debate and it involved great quantities of research and evidence. It involved intricate argument and counter-argument, deeply thought out cases and refutation. This wasn’t the type of thing that could be prepared for in a few days after learning the topic nor could it be evaluated by a lay-person.

Then --- wait a minute – what are my standards? If my standards are that the students’ future careers and lives be benefited shouldn’t I stop and see if this is the case before I rush to judgment?

Research has revealed that the ability to communicate effectively is the most valuable skill an individual can have. All of us who teach in this field are well aware that study after study reveals that employers are searching for potential employees with oral communication skills. They are looking for people to work in business, forestry, computer technology, chemistry, geology, politics, or any one of dozens of other specialized fields but they all want employees who are skilled communicators. Which form of debate most enhances the ability to communicate?

IPDA instructions tell debaters they should focus on their audience and adapt to it. Speak clearly and persuade your audience with argument, logic, and use evidence only to the extent that it can be done without resorting to reading from written materials during the round. Judges are told to vote for the “best debater” in the round and that person may either be the one who persuaded them the most or the one who is the “best speaker.” In view of these evaluation standards, debaters speak at a normal speaking rate, not so slow as to drag, but slowly enough that a reasonably educated person who actively listens can understand and follow the arguments. Debaters look at the judges. Studies show that eye contact is the single most effective nonverbal indicator of willingness to communicate and is a primary means of increasing the perception of immediacy (Richmond, McCroskey & Hickson, 2008). Debaters also stand upright with an open body position

with pleasant facial expressions, thereby completing the visual impression of immediacy; the best physical display for approachability and nonverbal communication of willingness to communicate (Richmond, McCroskey & Hickson, 2008). They speak at appropriately loud volume with varied rate and pitch, and if they follow the directions for IPDA they are alert for nonverbal feedback and make appropriate adjustments to their rate and volume in response to the feedback they receive from their judges. During the round IPDA debaters receive nonverbal feedback regarding their oral communication skills from judges. Following rounds they receive written feedback through the ballots cast by judges since two items on the ballot explicitly address communication delivery skills – they receive speaker points for the item “delivery” and for the item “appropriate tone” which is partially derived from nonverbal factors. No doubt a third point value item, courtesy is also influenced at least somewhat by the speaker’s nonverbal behaviors as well. On a nonverbal level IPDA seems to be teaching debaters good communication skills. This is important in view of the findings that, depending upon the specific message and context, 60 to 85% of the meaning of messages is transmitted nonverbally (Burgoon, Buller & Woodall, 1996; Richmond, McCroskey & Hickson, 2008).

How do NDT and CEDA fare in this regard? Since the focus in both of these forms of debate is upon presenting a very detailed case in which virtually every claim is supported by multiple pieces of evidence and then each speech thereafter must respond to every claim with arguments that are supported with multiple pieces of evidence (and all of these arguments and pieces of evidence have to be explained) and then of course there are counter-arguments and conflicting pieces of evidence whose relative merits need to be discussed as well as the credentials of the people who produced the evidence – and lots of other things that you probably already know and that it really isn’t appropriate for me to go into here since I’m not writing about how to debate in NDT or CEDA – the debaters are talking *very* fast. A typical debater who is going to enjoy any degree of success will be speaking at least 200 words per minute. Debaters in final rounds at the NDT national championship a decade ago were found to average well over 300 words per minute (Louden & Southworth, 1996) and they were on a path of continuing upward speed that had continued ever since the first NDT tournament in 1949. I guess it is no surprise then that they are looking down the entire time and there is zero eye contact. It doesn’t particularly bother the judge since the judge is busy looking down furiously writing to take a flow of the debate in the manner that has been learned in lots of specialized practice. That covers the auditory factors and the eye contact discussed with regard to IPDA debate, the other factors found that were parts of immediacy are also absent with NDT and CEDA Debate.

The typical debater in these forms of debate is standing with head bent down and is clutching either prepared written materials or the podium throughout the speaking period. There are some noteworthy exceptions to this. I remember one slender young man who would begin his constructive speeches by first taking a firm grasp on each side of the lectern, then taking a huge audible gasp of air. As he began to speak at an extremely rapid rate he sank slowly into a deep deep knee-bend. As he reached the bottom of the deep knee-bend he stopped speaking rose to a standing position while taking a very audible breath, and resumed speaking as he sank into another deep knee-bend. He

repeated this process over and over throughout the 10 or 8 minute speech. It was my firm belief that despite his relatively unimposing stature that he must have had the strongest thighs on the circuit. I also believed that there were many judges who were blissfully unaware of the behavior since they never looked up while he was speaking. Another, relatively large, young man, discovered he could keep his articulation clear while speaking very fast if he spoke in a shrill falsetto. It was very strange to have a man with a smooth baritone voice suddenly break into a rapid fire above soprano voice during debate rounds. In the days in which debaters were expected to dress for rounds and most debaters (and judges) were male there was also the incident in which one of the young men removed his sport coat due to the warmth of the room while he was speaking. After the speech he apologized to the judge for having taken his coat off saying "I'm sorry but it is just so hot in this room I couldn't take it." The judge replied saying that he didn't mind and would have done the same himself then commented that "Heck its all guys in here anyway, as hot as it is in here I wouldn't care if you dropped your trousers." The next debater went to the lectern and as he began to speak unbuckled his belt and proceeded to undo belt and pants and let them fall to his ankles and presented his entire speech with his pants around his ankles. Since the judge was looking down busily writing a flow of the arguments being presented he didn't realize what had taken place until the end of the speech when he looked up and saw the young man standing there with his pants around his ankles. All three of the young men I have singled out to describe routinely won top speaker awards at major tournaments. How could this happen when this is clearly not what we would refer to as quality speaking – good use of delivery factors? No. Speaker awards in NDT debate are awarded on the basis of coverage of arguments and presentation of evidence, not on the basis of delivery. Clearly NDT and CEDA debate do not do as good a job at preparing students to have the nonverbal delivery skills that employers are looking for when they say they want employees with good oral communication skills.

Research is also a valuable skill. While IPDA does help students develop research skills, NDT and CEDA debate place greater emphasis on research and I believe that we must concede that students gain greater knowledge of in-depth research with NDT and CEDA than with IPDA. Since these two forms of debate use the same topic all year it may be that they develop greater skill in the evolution of complex argumentation (at least on a single topic) as well. So in this area I must give the advantage to NDT and CEDA. I must, however, concede that after examining the forms of debate and considering the skills that potential employers are most interested in IPDA appears to be more beneficial for students future careers unless the student is planning to pursue a career that is limited to bibliographical and evidentiary research alone.

References

- Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B, & Woodall, W. G. *Nonverbal Communication: the unspoken dialogue*. 2nd Ed. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Louden, Allan D. and Southworth, William eds. *The 50th National Debate Tournament*. Winston-Salem, NC: Wake Forest University, 1996

Richmond, V. P. McCroskey, J. C., & Hickson, M. L. III *Nonverbal Behavior in Interpersonal Relations*. 6th Ed. Allyn and Bacon: Boston.

Meta-Debate: A necessity for any debate style.

Nicholas Ducote, Louisiana Tech University

Shane Puckett, Louisiana Tech University

Abstract

The IPDA style and community, through discourse in journal articles and adjudication structures, have not completely embraced various types of meta-debate. This article attempts to explain the need of meta-debate argumentation, and its necessity for any debate format. This article further explains that not being open to these types of arguments hurt debate styles in the long run.

Introduction

As a community, the International Public Debate Association is limiting and hurting themselves by not allowing complete access to all argumentation – not in a direct, regulated fashion, but through tacit understandings and pressure. Case construction and negative strategies most often center on a fact and counter-fact format. Fact debate is a perfectly viable format to conduct forensic discourse, but case construction is not the issue. Within the debate round, certain arguments are discouraged. Although procedural arguments and other meta-debate arguments are necessary for IPDA, their utilization is often discouraged. This prevents a check on dominant structures, halts evolution of style and limits access to education in rounds.

Hensley & Carlin (1999) give a thorough analysis of debate's origins; citing its origins to ancient Greece, and crediting Protagoras as the "father of debate". Protagoras was a pre-Socratic scholar that required his students to argue the pros and cons on a variety of issues. Plato later accredited Protagoras to being a sophist, one who laid more importance on the effect of the communication on the listener rather than truth. Aristotle thus began stressing the importance of truth and examination of both sides of an issue (Eldridge, 2008).

If we want to build a community of critical thinkers and ethical communicators; we must make sure that our students have complete access to tools to examine truth. If we deny them these tools, we are hindering the production of truth and education

This article will specifically examine three types of argument: topicality, vagueness, and kritiks. As a whole, these arguments operate in a pre-fiat framework, meaning that a judge should examine them before they look to the specific case advocacy. Of course, what the judge actually does depends on the arguments made in the round, but these arguments are theoretically pre-fiat. The procedural's function in the round is to check back abuse of the round. They prevent arguments which hinder education in the round, or stop the creation of rhetorical violence/oppression. In the debate world, arguments do not become more "real-world" than procedurals. Actually, one could argue that the only "real world" arguments that exist in any round are the ones pointing out the abuse and oppression created in the round in real time. Meta-debate arguments, such as procedural arguments, work to regulate debate within the activity itself and enable its evolution. Discussion of access to truth and education with meta-debate arguments is as valid and necessary as the role-playing arguments of "fiating" a

better. One of the only ways, and arguably the most dominant way, that students have access to a forum for change in the system is in-rounds. Denying or limiting their access to tools which shed light on problems in the activity or better ways to communicate, leaves the activity stagnate and it limits the educational value.

Meta-Debate is Crucial

Meta-debate is simply understood as debate about debate and discussion about an activity should necessarily preempt participation in it. Without a clear understanding of how an activity should be approached and conducted, its function is less than desirable. If a system of legalism were adopted, wherein certain arguments gained legitimacy simply through their intrinsic nature as a particular argument, debate would cease to be an educational activity. Education is foundationally the communal sharing of ideas, often referred to as the marketplace of ideas.

Every idea and rhetorical device should come to the marketplace on equal terms. Education and communication are inherently dynamic concepts. Only by engaging the topics and issues does the legitimacy of the different ideas become clear. However, if procedural arguments are thrown out simply because they *are* procedural arguments, the marketplace of ideas is compromised. Certainly, procedural arguments should not automatically win rounds, just as they should not lose them, or be thrown out. Stagnation is the ultimate result of rhetorical legalism. Any stagnation of argumentation denies the dynamism of communication itself, thus killing communication efforts. Evolution can never take place within the educational structures without accepting the legitimacy of all ideas. They should be weighed on the same equal plane as all other arguments. When that equal voice is given to procedural and other meta-debate arguments, education can once again flourish.

Yet, beyond simply ceasing to be educational, a legalism of rejecting procedurals because of their nature would actively discriminate against all debaters who wished to communicate these ideas. Fundamentally, such a structure would resemble nothing short of bigotry – where individuals are given a certain worth based on their intrinsic nature, not their actual utility as a member of society. Without the utilization of meta-debate, not only does the activity stagnate, but it also concentrates all the power in an elitist structure. This power is concentrated in a few community members with similar ideologies and utilized to oppress minority voices. These minority voices are those debaters that choose to utilize procedurals and other meta-debate argumentation. Oppression is intrinsically an undesirable system. Not only does it practically disadvantage a community, but it also results in minority violence. The same thinking that justifies this intellectual elitism can be turned toward society and such is the foundation of critical thinking – our rhetoric has a very direct effect on the world.

The only way to change and evolve a style and the members within it is through meta-debate. Articles and papers can be published until every author is deceased and the IPDA Journal no longer exists, but only losing rounds will change the activity. This proposal is not a call to immediate alteration within a particular style, but simply a call to openness. That openness will create an environment that is *open* to change. All that is necessary for education and equality to occur is an openness, not a forcible reformation.

Oppression within IPDA

Until this point, discrimination and rhetorical legalism have only been mentioned in general terms. At this point, the article will point to these oppressive structures within IPDA. Within IPDA, rationales for rejecting meta-debate stem from false perceptions. Procedural critics understand them as a waste of time, not necessary for education, and superfluous to the function of the round. Often, these arguments are perceived as confusing and tedious. As previously demonstrated, this could not be further from the truth. Eldridge (2008) demonstrates this type of oppressive reasoning when he writes about the horrors of “technical debate.”

Members of the debate community have also voiced concerns that the kritik unnecessarily adds density and esoteric vernacular to a pursuit already brimming with technical jargon. In addition to understanding the code debaters use to refer to their arguments, novices dealing with kritiks must begin to wrestle with the fabulously abstruse wordplay of Michel Foucault, Martin Heidegger, and Jacques Derrida if they hope to defend against them. (Eldridge, 2008)

The primary cause for the oppression of the minority voices of meta-debate results from a fundamental misunderstanding of the argumentation. Procedural arguments are not intrinsically confusing. Indeed, most procedural arguments are very commonsensical and necessary for educational debate.

Topicality

Topicality’s utility is universally recognized. If a team is truly outside of the resolution, they should lose the round. In very common sense terms, a topicality argument functions as a check on “red herring fallacies” being applied to the round. Brownlee (1981) writes on the subject, explaining that topicality is vital to the preservation of debate as an educational activity. While some judges dislike topicality and others adore it, not many people will completely reject its use. IPDA rules make it clear that the affirmative team has the “right to define.” The language of the rule makes it clear that there is ground for topicality, but that ground is very inflexible. Interpretation of this rule has led to many debaters nearly eliminating the ground that the negative has for arguments. The rules make a very destructive assumption, which is dangerous to education. Contained within the rules is the tacit understanding that there are limited “reasonable” interpretations of the resolution. When debaters posit that a particular phrase can only have a limited amount of reasonable interpretations, they automatically eliminate other interpretations. The interpretation of language is, by its very nature, completely subjective and open to debate. This does not mean that topicality cannot be debated because every interpretation is equally valid. On the contrary, some interpretations can be more effective or reasonable to utilize in forensics – setting the foundation for the topicality debate. However, to assume that some interpretations are, by default, more reasonable is to preclude the use of others, thereby destroyed the very nature of language.

This fundamental misunderstanding of topicality is often poorly applied in debate rounds. The IPDA rules make it clear that topicality is reasonable and simply requests that debaters approach it in a reasonable way. However, debaters become unreasonable when they throw out any topicality argument simply because the affirmative has the right to define.

Framework

Another issue fundamentally misunderstood concept is framework. As previously discussed, fact debate framework is used more often than not in IPDA rounds. While this framework is acceptable, absolutely rejecting other framework used to test the resolution true is unacceptable. Many debaters find that appeals to authority somehow justify their use of a certain framework, and many adjudicators allow such arguments. The use of policy and value frameworks as counter-examples is not meant to preclude other frameworks, but utilizes commonly-known frameworks to prove a point. Even when the 1977-78 CEDA chose a “non-policy proposition” Henderson (1977) wrote that the framework as policy or non-policy was completely subjective and open to debate. Often, the response to an attack on the fact framework is that the debater’s coach told them to run that framework, it is always run as such, or other frameworks are simply too “technical.” This fear of the “other” (in this case, procedural argumentation), which can sometimes be complex, creates an oppressive environment. Again, it is this static, legalistic perception of dynamic rhetoric that creates oppression and undermines education.

Kritiks

Within the structure of debate, kritiks function as a check for in-round rhetorical violence and oppression. Kritiks can also be viewed as a “complex” or “technical” argument, thus most IPDA adjudicators will respond superfluously or with the generic “this argument is too complicated for IPDA.” Unfortunately, this argument is nonresponsive. Even to assume that one argument is somehow more “simple” than another is ignorant. Indeed, those who view kritiks as external to the policy framework clearly misunderstand the argumentation. Gehrke (2000) explicitly states that kritiks function should always be included within policy discussion. He argues that they underlie the very basic assumptions of policy, which must be addressed before we can ever hope to solve issues. At some point, debaters had to learn to utilize a fact framework, just as they learn to utilize kritiks. The reaction to kritiks by most debaters and judges, however, physically creates a system of rhetorical oppression and violence. Those debaters who chose to utilize kritiks to check back rhetorical oppression are, ironically, the victim of it. The previously quoted Eldridge (2008) demonstrates this frame of mind specifically toward kritiks. Even if it were the case that Foucault and Heidegger make up the majority of critical argumentation, that would not make it taboo. If the kritik uses Foucault or Heidegger and there is a clear link to the oppression, this proves that the oppression is still alive and well in these structures. The point of a kritik is to point out these abuses and the oppression in hopes to stop them in the future. The previous discussion of education and oppression is especially important here. When the elites specifically reject certain authors from the public debate because they are “too complex,” they create an environment completely antithetical to education.

Conclusion

Echoing Cirlin’s (2007) comments:

Debate is clearly competitive and ought to be fun. But let’s not get so carried away with the competition or the fun that we forget we are engaged in what should fundamentally be an educational activity.

All of the arguments conclude with these words. Fundamentally, debate, in any style, is about education. An organization sacrifices education for “fun” and refuses to accept

arguments that it deems “too complex.” At the point that this occurs, it is time for a very basic change in the organization; not a reformation of structure or authority, but a definite overhaul of the philosophies and mindsets governing the activity. This paper is a call to an ideological revolution, to change the way an organization views dynamic communication.

Works Cited

- Cirlin, Alan (2008). Defending a Core Position in IPDA Debate. *Journal of the International Public Debate Association.*, 2008. 3-18.
- Brownlee, Don (1981). In Search of Topicality: Definitions and Contexts. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate.* 32-35.
- Eldridge, Daniel (2008). Academic Debate’s Minority Group. *Journal of the International Public Debate Association.* 7-10.
- Gehrke, Pat J. (1998). Critique Arguments as Policy Analysis: Policy Debate Beyond the Rationalist Perspective. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate.* 18-39.
- Henderson, Bill (1980). Theoretical Implications of Debate Non-Policy Propositions. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate.* 1-8.
- Hensley, D., & Carlin, D. (1999). *Mastering Competitive Debate* (5th ed.). Topeka KS: Clark.
- Richey, P(2007). Academic Debate v. Advocacy in the Real World: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of the International Public Debate Association.* 26-33.

Counterplans as Opportunity Cost: A view of counterplan function in academic debate

Caitlin Hodge, Louisiana Tech University
Shane Puckett, Louisiana Tech University

Abstract

This essay presents an evaluation of the counterplan's function in academic debate. It describes the purpose of the counterplan and reasoning for the existence of negative fiat in debate, by explaining reciprocity and competing advocacies. The essay further presents a view of the counterplan as an opportunity cost to plan and explains why this view is best for fairness and education in the round.

Counterplans offer a viable alternative strategy for the negative team that reflects real world decision making and uphold the practices of fairness and education in debate. The counterplan functions as an alternative action that, by its desirability and exclusion of the affirmative plan, serves as a reason to reject plan. This essay posits that the counterplan should be viewed as an opportunity cost to plan, in that it is an alternative possibility for the solution of the harms presented in case or implicit in the resolution that thus excludes the action of plan, which can then be weighed against the plan in terms of costs and benefits.

Roger Solt (1989) explained that "a counterplan is a negative plan (that is, the negative team has designed and specified its details), which is offered to the judge as an alternative possessing coequal status with the plan. (p. 127)" Since, people generally do not evaluate solutions on an individual basis, but instead in comparison with other possibilities (for example, when political candidates or leaders present different options for solving economic problems), a plan versus counterplan debate accurately reflects real world decision making, and thus develops skills that are applicable both in and out of the debate round. It "focuses [the debate] on action and promotes choices between alternatives" (Walker, 1989, p. 181).

However, in order for the negative team to be able to present alternative possibilities for solution rather than simply argue probabilities, or what the status quo will do, the negative must have access to fiat. Fiat is the ability to assume that, for the debate, a plan will pass and assess its benefits and implications rather than the probability of its implementation. Affirmative fiat is grounded in the idea of assessing a plan for its desirability instead of its political feasibility (Solt, 1989), and competitive equity gives rise to the idea that "both sides receive the same fiat" (Katsulas, 1999, p. 74).

Negative fiat then is simply a matter of reciprocity. As Solt (1989, p. 129) explained, “The affirmative is allowed to design in detail a policy and offer it for consideration on its own merits, regardless of its political practicality. Thus, there seems to be at least some equity interest in allowing the negative to design its own policy and advocate its own merits.” Without negative fiat, the affirmative team would be allowed to envision possibilities while the negative team would be forced to always defend what is happening or what he or she can prove will happen in the status quo. Since this requires the negative to first prove that an action will happen before addressing the preferability of that argument, while the affirmative merely has to show that an action is preferable, the lack of negative fiat puts the negative at a great disadvantage. By allowing for negative fiat, and thus the presentation of different possibilities for a solution to agreed-upon harms, it is possible to reflect real world decision making and increase the educational value and fairness of the debate round.

Though Solt (1989) restricted negative fiat to U.S. actors, the literature or specific additions to the resolution, Susan Stanfield and Isaac West (1995) offer an explanation of negative fiat in terms of reciprocity that is more ideal for a public style of debate with a changing resolution, like IPDA. They suggest that a fair division of ground would restrict the negative to a single actor (not simply a U.S. actor), such as “the government of any one foreign nation, or any governing body (such as the United Nations or a Non-governmental Organization).” (Stanfield and West, 1995, p. 9). This is particularly important for resolutions addressing problems in other nations, as they point out that “The view that foreign governments cannot solve problems on their own imposes an ethnocentric and hegemonistic view into an activity that strives for the openness of ideas.” (Stanfield and West, 1995, p. 10). Thus, the best balance of fairness and education in the round comes from allowing the negative team to fiat any single actor in order to present an alternative possibility for the solution of the presented harms. This creates a single advocacy for the affirmative and the negative that allows for the evaluation of competing solutions.

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 (Cirlin, 2008).

This understanding of negative’s fiat ability is in line with the core values of IPDA argumentation. Cirlin’s (2008) interpretation of acceptable refutation discusses the ability of the negative to access counter-plans in IPDA.

Because the resolution directs debate (Solt, 1989, p. 126), negative fiat should reflect affirmative fiat. That is, it should allow for the analysis of a single possible solution for the harms presented in the affirmative case or implied in the resolution. The counterplan should attempt to discount the plan by presenting a solution that would not occur if the plan were enacted, whether it be through the action of an alternate agent (such as the actions of states, different federal departments, different national governments or international governing bodies) or through another course of action. Thus, the counterplan functions as the opportunity cost to the plan.

In his essay, “The Decision-Maker,” Michael Korkok (1999) explained opportunity cost:

For decision-making purposes, a seemingly simple but ultimately subtle answer to the problem of valuation is available: the value of a choice is the difference between its worth and the worth of the best alternative that must be forgone. The worth of the best alternative that must be forgone is called a choice's *opportunity cost*. (p. 64)

The counterplan is the opportunity cost to plan because it presents a better alternative to the plan, and thus allows us to look at the plan as an option instead of as the only option to solve the harms. The application to debate becomes clear:

The negative team presents counterplans as opportunities that would be sacrificed if the affirmative plan were to be adopted. Counterplan competition with the affirmative plan is just the idea that adoption of the plan would foreclose the opportunity of enacting the counterplan. The decision-rule applied is that the affirmative plan should be adopted if and only if it is better than the competitive counterplan. (Korkok, 1999, p. 64)

This allows us to evaluate affirmative plans in the realm of possibilities in order to find the best possible solution, rather than solely evaluating the plan versus the status quo. The counterplan is thus the next best scenario – the best option that would be forgone due to the action of plan.

For example, in a round with the resolution *The United States should increase aid to Sub-Saharan Africa to combat malaria*; the affirmative team might show that there is a need for 10 million mosquito nets in Sub-Saharan Africa then present the plan that the U.S. government would provide these 10 million mosquito nets. Instead of being forced to show that malaria was not a problem or that nothing beyond the status quo should be done to fix the problem, the negative could then present the counterplan that World Health Organization should give these 10 million mosquito nets to Sub-Saharan Africa along with analysis as to why the World Health Organization would be a better actor. If the World Health Organization were to solve for the harms presented, the U.S. would no longer need to, and thus no longer should, send the mosquito nets. Thus the counterplan provides an opportunity cost to plan, and would discount the validity of plan as the best option to solve the malaria problem.

In her answer to Korkok's analysis, Gina Lane (1999, p. 87) posited that economic opportunity cost theory cannot apply to academic debate because costs can only be incurred directly by the chooser. However, the judge must weigh costs and benefits in any debate round in order to make a decision – the fact that the judge is not the President or Congress does not change the fact that he or she must evaluate the President or Congress's actions as they are presented in the plan. Furthermore, the judge does not role-play as a particular actor but instead "intellectually endorses" (Korkok, 1999, p. 55) the plan or counterplan. The judge cannot perform the actions presented and thus takes the role of endorsing an action as desirable or preferable. When plans are evaluated in terms of what is net beneficial or through cost-benefit analysis, the judge is able to evaluate (and to some extent incur) the costs of possible changes to his or her world in order to assess what is most beneficial.

Even Korkok (1999) overlimited the ability of the judge to evaluate counterplans, and thus the ability of negative teams to present them, by restricting negative fiat to the resolitional actor. This is problematic because it excludes analysis of foreign actors or international bodies, which, as Stanfield and West (1995, p. 10) described, creates an

ethnocentric and imperialistic debate round. Further it does not fit with the analysis of the opportunity cost as the excluded option and the judge as the endorser, not actor, of the plan or counterplan. In the mosquito net example, if the judge chooses to endorse the World Health Organization's action through the counterplan, then the judge forgoes the opportunity cost of endorsing the plan as the best option. John Katsulas (1999, p. 74) explained that "a judge's range of choices are not limited by the real-world decision making authority of the agent of action because the judge's role is to evaluate policy arguments presented by competing advocates." Thus the judge acts in the real world capacity of a citizen evaluating and choosing whether or not to endorse government actions. As a result, the judge can freely evaluate the counterplan as an opportunity cost and thus weight the plan in terms of the alternative solution presented by the counterplan rather than in terms of the harms in the status quo.

Viewing the counterplan as an opportunity cost allows us to evaluate alternative plans to find the best possible solution by looking at the option that is forgone when action is taken. This casts the debate in a framework in which the negative is allowed the same access to analysis of possibilities as the affirmative and in which the judge can evaluate and endorse a policy in terms of competing solutions. This is uniquely beneficial for debate as it applies real world decision-making practices to the debate and allows for critical exploration and analysis of policy options in a fair and educational debate round.

Works cited:

- Cirlin, Alan (2008). Defending a Core Position in IPDA Debate. *Journal of the International Public Debate Association*, 2008. 3-18.
- Katsulas, J. P. (1999). Locating negative fiat: A response to Korkok. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate Forum*, 20, 69-75.
- Korkok, M. M. (1999). The decision-maker. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate Forum*, 20, 49-68.
- Lane, G. E. (1999). Buchanan's opportunity cost theory as it applies to academic debate practices: A response to Korkok. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate Forum*, 20, 84-91.
- Solt, R. (1989). Negative fiat: Resolving the ambiguities of "should." *Argumentation and Advocacy: The Journal of the American Forensic Association*, XXV, 3, 121-139.
- Stanfield, S., & West, I. (1995). Counterplans: The evolution of negative burdens as CEDA makes the transition from value to policy debate. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (81st, San Antonio, TX).
- Walker, G. B. (1989). The counterplan as argument in non-policy debate. *Argumentation and Advocacy: The Journal of the American Forensic Association*, XXV, 3, 178-191.