

THE NATURE OF ARGUMENTATION

The *activity* of Argumentation may be conceived of as preparation for and, potentially, engaging in debate. In debate, the arguer is limited to the use of logical argument and evidence. This would seem to imply the traditional view of Argumentation.

The traditional view: Argumentation is a sub-category/offshoot of Rhetoric that limits itself to the use of rational argument and evidence.

Sample textbook definitions from within this perspective include:

"Use of logic to influence others."

"The art and science of using primarily logical appeals to secure decisions."

This definition is not wrong, but rather, incomplete. The problem is that it does not give us a *rationale* for such behavior in a rhetorical (i.e., persuasive) context.

Aristotle's Definition of Rhetoric: "Rhetoric is the art of discovering, in any given case, the available means of persuasion."

In the Classical conception of rhetoric, the available means include:

The Aristotelian persuasive appeals

Ethos

Pathos

Logos

The Five Canons of Rhetoric

Invention

Disposition

Style

Memory

Delivery

In short, rhetoric attempts to encompass *all* strategies and tactics used to influence others.

Yet, under the traditional view, argumentation would forgo two of the three Aristotelian appeals (Ethos and Pathos) and at least two of the Five Canons (Style and Delivery).

So, *why* would one create a type of rhetoric so limited and limiting?

Development of the traditional view:

The traditional view of Argumentation can be traced to the "founder" of the discipline, **Richard Whately** (1787-1863) and his book *Elements of Rhetoric* (1828).

In his treatment of rhetoric Whately emphasized Invention and Disposition. He contended that rhetoric is "an offshoot of Logic" and that the fundamental character and purpose of rhetoric was the logical invention and disposition of arguments. "The *finding* of suitable ARGUMENTS to prove a given point, and the skillful *arrangement* of them, may be considered as the immediate and proper province of Rhetoric, and of that alone." [emphasis Whately's] (Whately adopts this focus for a variety of reasons. He is a Christian apologist in an increasingly scientific and skeptical age. Also, he is reacting to other schools of rhetoric that focused primarily on style and delivery.)

Whately does discuss other aspects of rhetoric (appeals to character and the "passions," good style and proper delivery) as important to practical persuasion. He asserts that they are important, and often necessary, as means of promoting the acceptance of the rhetor's arguments. However. . . .

Some students of rhetoric "over learned" Whately's emphasis and created a rhetoric which utilized *only* logical argument and evidence.

That led to the creation of the sub-discipline of rhetoric we call "argumentation" which:

- a) involves persuasive communication (mostly as debate), and
- b) limits itself to the use of rational argument and evidence.

Your text, however, takes a view of argumentation that is somewhat broader than the purely traditional view.

ZK- "Argumentation is a language based social phenomenon that enables us to *discover* what beliefs and actions are reasonable in any social context and that is concerned with the selection and organization of ideas to *justify* particular positions." (emphasis mine)

Beneath all that language is the idea that argumentation is concerned not only with persuasive advocacy (justifying positions) but also with inquiring into (discovering) what "beliefs and actions" are worthy of acceptance in the first place.

Where does the element of "inquiry" come from?

One explanation is simple; before you can make persuasive arguments you have to develop/invent/discover them.

However, there is another, somewhat more profound, explanation:

The *goals* of argumentation are, in some ways, *different* from the goals of rhetoric.

Rhetoric is concerned simply with finding a way to persuade an audience to accept a particular position/point of view/decision. Rhetoric doesn't really care what the concept being advocated is.

Unlike rhetoric, argumentation can be viewed as concerned with *finding* the "correct/true" position on a controversy and then finding a way to *persuade* an audience to *accept* that "correct/true" position.

Viewed in this way the limitations of Argumentation make sense.

The Canons of Style and Delivery do not contribute substantively to the search for "truth."

Ethos and Pathos appeals do not contribute substantively to the search for "truth."

So we can view Argumentation as an *overlapping art* of **Inquiry** (finding "truth"), and **Advocacy/Persuasion** (supporting "truth").

As an art of **inquiry**, Argumentation has two functions.

1. To aid in determining the logical proof requirements (more on this phrase later) of a controversy.
2. To aid in determining which positions meet these requirements.

Argumentation as an art of **advocacy** again has two functions.

1. To demonstrate the "truth" of the position being advocated.
2. To attack alternative positions in an attempt to discredit them.

Sample definitions from other authorities who adopt this view include:

"Argumentation is concerned mainly with the conditions of *justifiable* (emphasis mine) belief."

"A method of analysis and reasoning designed to provide acceptable bases for belief and action."

Class definition: Argumentation is a method of inquiry leading to probable truth and a method of persuasion leading to justifiable belief.

By the way, this concept is not exactly new. The Sophist Protagoras argued in the 5th Century BC that debate was the most reliable means of determining what ideas were most worthy of belief; because debate subjects ideas to examination and attack only worthy ideas are likely to survive this process. The Sophist Isocrates makes a related point, that thoughtful decision making and argument are fundamentally the same thing.

"With this faculty (rhetoric) we both contend against others on matters which are open to dispute and seek light for ourselves on things which are unknown; for the same arguments which we use in persuading others when we speak in public, we employ also when we deliberate in our own thoughts; and, while we call eloquent those who are able to speak before a crowd, we regard as sage those who most skillfully debate their problems in their own minds."

UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS IN ARGUMENTATION

1. "Truth" in argumentative situations is only probable truth.

Rhetoric has traditionally dealt with probabilities.
We do not argue over the proven or clearly provable.

2. Argumentation presupposes a controversy.

There are assumed to be two, and only two, sides to the controversy.
The controversy is generally conceived to be a choice between
a) Adopting a new belief/course of action, or
b) Retaining the current belief/course of action.

3. Argumentation is very rule governed.

Argumentative procedures are very structured.
The procedures must be followed very carefully to avoid confusion.
(The rules may at times seem petty but they force you to think rigorously.)

4. Argumentation assumes that we are heading toward a debate

Indeed, the rules of argumentation to be discussed are often based on the rules of debate.

BASIC CONCEPTS

PROPOSITIONS

Propositions specify the *essence* of the controversy.

1. The Proposition specifies the subject area of the debate.
It tells us what the boundaries of the debate are.
The boundaries determine what is "**topical**" (relevant) in the particular debate
2. The Proposition also defines the two sides of the controversy:
The **Affirmative** side supports the proposition
The **Negative** side opposes the proposition

Rules for Phrasing Propositions

1. Propositions are *always assertions* (statements)!
They are not simply topics for discussion.
They are not questions.
This is so because the Affirmative must support and the Negative must attack the Proposition.
You can't attack a topic or a question.
2. They should begin with the phrase "*Resolved: That*"
3. Propositions call for a change from the status quo.
4. Propositions specify the general nature and direction of change.
5. Propositions should have only one central idea.
6. Propositions should be worded in specific ways
They should use neutral terminology.
They should be worded clearly.
They should be worded concisely.
They should avoid the use of the word "not." (the reason for this will become clear later)

Types of Propositions

1. Propositions of Judgment [Fact/Value]

Traditionally, this category was split into two categories.

1. Fact

Makes a judgment concerning truth and/or falsehood.

Deals with assertions that can, at least in theory, be proven true or false by reference to the "real world."

Factual propositions can be broken down further into

Descriptive (dealing with past or present facts), and

Predictive (dealing with future facts)

2. Value

Makes a subjective judgment concerning the worth of something.

Such judgments cannot, even in theory, be proven true or false by reference to the "real world."

These are referred to in the book as **Evaluative** statements.

These two categories have been combined because:

1) Both call for a "judgment" (a decision), and

2) Judgments concerning facts and/or values turn out not to be completely discrete categories.

So we think of them as subtypes of a larger category, **Judgment**.

3. Policy

Deals with assertions that call for action to be taken.

Built on "sub propositions" of fact and value (more on this concept later).

When analyzing a proposition, other basic concepts/rules must be kept in mind.

PRESUMPTION

Presumption is defined as the belief that the **status quo** is presumed to be "correct" until proven otherwise.

Before we can continue the discussion of "presumption" we must stop and consider the concept of "status quo."

STATUS QUO is defined as the current situation/state of affairs.

The concept of status quo may be understood in several different ways:

1. The Status Quo may be thought of as the current state of the "real world."

This is the most common definition.

This is the one we will most commonly use.

2. The Status Quo may be thought of as the current attitudes and beliefs of the audience being addressed.

Less traditional but in many cases the most practical/valid definition.

Note that 1 and 2 may overlap or they may not.

3. The Status Quo may be thought of as an arbitrarily designated position.

e.g., the defendant is innocent until proven guilty

However "status quo" is defined, presumption is an *advantage* accorded to the side that opposes change from the current state of affairs (which, by the rules for phrasing Propositions, is the Negative).

The concept of Presumption may be considered to be:

1 Natural (somehow residing in the natural order of things)

Richard Whately held that people have a natural preference for the settled and familiar.

In fact, psychology and sociology tell us that beliefs, attitudes and practices do tend to continue unchanged unless "forced" to change by some outside agency.

2. Artificial (a commonly agreed upon but basically arbitrary rule)

e.g., the defendant is innocent until proven guilty

BURDEN OF PROOF

The Burden of Proof is the requirement placed on the side advocating change (by phrasing rules, the Affirmative) to present a compelling case which overcomes the presumption and justifies accepting the change/proposition being advocated.

The effect of the Presumption/Burden of Proof rules is that the side with presumption (Negative) wins all ties.

PRIMA FACIE CASE

A Prima Facie case is one that *compels a response* from the other side.

This is because it at least appears strong enough to overcome the presumption and thus to fulfill the burden of proof.

BURDEN OF REBUTTAL

The Burden of Rebuttal is defined as the obligation all parties in a controversy have to attack/respond to arguments that have been advanced and supported by the other side.

(This is also called the responsibility to **Clash** with the opponent.)

The Burden of Rebuttal *shifts back and forth* throughout the debate, falling on whichever side is losing at the time.

Thus, if a prima facie case is presented by the advocate of change (the Affirmative), the advocate of the Status Quo (the Negative) has a Burden of Rebuttal.

If, in turn, the Negative fulfills its' Burden of Rebuttal, the Burden of Rebuttal then shifts to the Affirmative.

Clash is important to the "truth" seeking aspect of argumentation.

It is the mechanism by which we test ideas.

Only those ideas that can stand up to rigorous examination/attack should be considered worthy of adoption.

ISSUES

Definition: Issues are **inherent questions vital** to the advocate's cause.

Questions:

- All issues are phrased as questions.
- All issues are phrased as yes/no questions.
- All issues are phrased so the Affirmative wants to answer "yes."

Vital:

- The Affirmative must show that the answer to all issue questions is yes or else lose the debate.
- Issue questions specify the **logical proof requirements** of the proposition.
 - The term "logical proof requirements" means the things that must be proven in order to justify adopting the proposition.
 - The logical proof requirements of a proposition *specify the burden of proof* for the Affirmative.
- Thus the Negative can win a debate by showing that the answer to any *one* of the issue questions is no.
- Not all questions *relevant* to a proposition are *vital* to the Affirmative.

Distinctions among different "types" of issues

The text distinguishes between potential vs. real issues:

Potential: The list of all issues that "exist within a given proposition" (all topical issues).

Real: The issues that "actually become a basis of clash" (ambiguous phrase, in this class it means issues raised by one side or the other)

Real issues are a *subset* of the potential issues

It is often useful to make two other distinctions

Admitted: All issues raised by one side that the other side chooses not to contest.

Actual: The issues actually contested in the debate.

Real issues – admitted issues = actual issues

Inherent:

- Issues are questions that *necessarily* come up in a reasonable analysis and/or argument of a proposition.
- Issue questions "are *not created* [emphasis mine] by the participants in the dispute, but rather exist within the statement and historic context of the resolution." [ZK]
- Issues are seen as somehow pre-existing (if that's a word) within the proposition.
- Therefore, we do not talk of inventing issues; we speak of *finding/discovering* issues.
- (As a metaphor, think of exploring a physical space in order to find physical objects.)

NOTE: Issue questions are *narrower in scope* than the propositions within which they exist.

They are parts of the proposition, but *only* parts.

They are proof for the proposition.

The sentence "*Proposition because issue contention.*" should not be a tautology.

Rules for Phrasing Issues

1. Issues are phrased as yes/no questions that the Affirmative wants to answer yes.
2. Issue questions do not merely rephrase the proposition. (Remember that they are narrower!)
3. Issue questions focus on a single idea.
4. Issue questions are worded in neutral terminology.
5. Issue questions are worded clearly.
6. Issue questions are worded concisely.

ISSUE ANALYSIS

Analysis (definitions):

- a) The separating of any...entity into its' constituent elements;
- b) This process as a method of studying the nature of something or of determining its' essential features and their relations

There are two aspects to issue analysis:

- a) **Background** analysis, and
- b) **Issue** analysis proper

Analysis of the Background of a Controversy

1. Understand the terminology being used in the controversy. [VERY IMPORTANT]

All important terms of the proposition, issues, sub-issues, etc., should be carefully **defined**.

These definitions tell us *precisely* the boundaries and focus of the controversy/debate.

Remember that the boundaries determine what is "topical" in the controversy/debate.

This is related to the notion that "words must establish limits" (Standard #4) in the text.

Guidelines for definitions include:

Definitions should be developed within the "field context" of the Proposition. (Standard #1)

Therefore the standard dictionary definition of a term is often insufficient.

Definitions should not be phrased or interpreted to ignore or stretch the rules of grammar or syntax.

(Standard #2)

Definitions should be phrased and interpreted such that every word in it is meaningful. (Standard #3)

Define the terms of a proposition as meaningful units, not necessarily as individual words.

Definitions should be phrased in neutral language.

Definitions should be reasonable (~squirrelly), though they need not be obvious.

Debate Procedure for defining terms

The Affirmative has the prerogative of defining terms at the start of a debate.

The Affirmative definition will stand unless successfully challenged.

The Negative has the right to challenge the definitions.

The Negative cannot challenge a definition without cause, however.

A successful challenge must show the proposed definition to be unfair or inappropriate.

If the Negative challenges, it must also propose new definitions.

Which proposed definitions are most acceptable becomes a continuing issue in the debate.

2. Consider the immediate cause(s) of the controversy.

Why is the matter particularly controversial at the current time?

3. Examine the nature and history of the Status Quo.

Almost no situation is completely new.

How did the current situation develop?

4. Examine the nature and history of the proposal.

Almost no proposal is completely new.

What proposals have been made prior to this?

What has been the fate of this (or similar) proposal(s) previously?

5. Discover common ground. ("Common ground" = ideas on which Affirmative & Negative can agree)

Common ground serves to narrow potential issues.

Common ground establishes starting points for argument.

All productive argument must be grounded in ideas that both sides accept.

Without common ground arguments either:

- a) regress rather than progress (e.g., a small child continuing to ask "why?")
- b) miss the opponents' ideas completely (e.g., the abortion debate)

Issue Analysis

Stasis Formula of Issue Analysis for Propositions of Judgment

1. The Frame of Jurisdiction

What concepts/ideas/arguments are topical?

This is more a "quality control" check; it does not actually help to *find* issues.

2. The Frame of Definition

Defining the key term(s) of the proposition will tell us what criteria must be met if the proposition is to be judged to be true.

Definitions should tend toward the measurable whenever possible.

Therefore synonym definitions are often insufficient.

Definitions may have multiple components.

3. The Frame of Existence of Fact

Are these criteria met in this case?

4. The Frame of Quality.

Are there additional facts or unusual circumstances that must be taken into account in this particular situation?

Stock Issues for Issue Analysis of Propositions of Policy

1. The Stock Issue of Jurisdiction

What concepts/ideas/arguments are topical?

This is more a "quality control" check; it does not actually help to find issues.

2. The Stock Issue of Ill

Is there currently a problem in the Status Quo?

Is the problem significant?

Does the *impact* of the problem make it *qualitatively* significant?

Does the *extent* of the problem make it *quantitatively* significant?

3. The Stock Issue of Blame

Is the cause of the problem inherent in the Status Quo?

Is the problem one that the SQ cannot overcome? (structural inherency)

Is the problem one that the SQ will not overcome? (attitudinal inherency)

Is the problem one that the SQ should not overcome? (philosophical inherency)

4. The Stock Issue of Cure

Does the Affirmative have a plan?

Will the Affirmative plan solve the problem?

Does the Affirmative plan address the factors of the status quo that are creating the problem?

Is the Affirmative plan practical?

5. The Stock Issue of Cost

Are there any major ("killer") side effect disadvantages to the Affirmative plan?

Do side effect advantages of the plan outweigh side effect disadvantages?

NOTE: Stock Issue questions parallel propositions of judgment and therefore can be analyzed and proven by the same methods as propositions of judgment.

ARGUMENT AND EVIDENCE

BASIC ARGUMENT STRUCTURE

An **argument** is defined as *a complete unit of persuasive proof*.

A unit of proof consists of a *claim linked to reasons to believe the claim*.

Stephen Toulmin describes the basic structure of an argument.

There are *three core elements* of Toulmin's model.

All three of these elements *must be present* in any persuasive argument.

If any of the elements is missing the argument will lack persuasive force. [i.e., it will be non-sense]

The first element of the Toulmin model is the **Claim** (ZK: Conclusion).

The Claim is simply the point you are trying to prove.

Arguments, especially in debate, typically begin with the statement of a Claim.

According to Toulmin, if the Claim is not challenged the "argument" is over at that point.

If the Claim is challenged the speaker must "back up" and provide Data.

The second element of the Toulmin model is **Data**.

Data are pieces of information presented in support of a Claim.

According to Toulmin, if the audience accepts the Data the "argument" is over.

If audience does not see the relevance between Claim and Data the speaker must supply the Warrant.

The third element of the Toulmin model is the **Warrant** (ZK: Reasoning Process).

The Warrant serves to link the Claim to the Data.

The Warrant justifies the leap between Claim and Data.

In ordinary argument (rhetoric) we commonly argue using **enthymemes**.

An enthymeme is an argument in which the speaker omits one or more elements of the argument, relying on the audience to supply the needed elements for themselves.

In argumentation we tend to make more *complete arguments*.

The debater *must* at least provide Claim and Data (Otherwise the claim is "**asserted**").

Remember that one function of argumentation is the critical examination of ideas.

No idea can be accepted without good reasons being presented.

The reasoning behind a claim must be open so that it can be challenged

This is also due to the nature of debate "audiences."

A debater must assume that the *other side* in the debate will challenge any given point.

A *debate judge* is trained to give the debater no "help."

Other audiences are often *hostile*.

Also relevant here is the concept of **argument fields** (also a Toulmin concept).

A field is a community that subscribes to a common set of standards for judging the worth of arguments.

Arguments are evaluated according to standards of the "field" in which the argument is presented.

Different fields have different standards.

The field of Argumentation requires relatively high standards of proof.

CLAIMS

Remember that a claim is any statement you are trying to prove.

In Argumentation claims are usually thought of in terms of:

- a) the **proposition** itself
- b) stands taken on issue questions (**contentions**)
- c) **reasons** for accepting a given contention (**sub-contentions**), etc.

CONCLUSIONS

There are three types of Conclusions.

Conclusions of Existence assert that something is real or exists.

Answer the question "Is it?"

Such Conclusions are specific to a particular situation.

Conclusions of Essence identify an essential feature, basic attribute, or characteristic property of something.

Answer the question "What is it?"

Such Conclusions are universal in that they include all members of a class.

Conclusions of Explanation relate phenomena so as to account for their existence or to make their existence intelligible.

Answer the question "Why is it?"

Such Conclusions can be either specific or universal.

DATA

ZK define data as "the starting point of arguments."

Data may be divided into **two major categories**.

The first category of Data is **Premises**.

Premises are "fundamental assumptions or beliefs. . . that we accept without external support."

Any argument, if it is to be successful, must ultimately be based on a premise accepted by the audience.

Remember the idea of *common ground* with the opponent.

Premises may be categorized in two ways.

By the *content* of the premise.

Perceptual Premises are assumptions about the nature of things (facts). [Beliefs]

Value Premises are judgments concerning the worth of something. [Attitudes/Values]

Premises may also be categorized by *who holds* the premise.

Personal Premises are assumptions that you accept.

Audience Premises are premises that your audience accepts.

The two categories are not necessarily the same.

Specific premises may be discovered in three ways.

A speaker may state a premise explicitly.

A premise may be inferred from other statements of a speaker.

A premise may be inferred from the generally accepted premises of a community.

The second major category of Data is **Evidence**.

Evidence is information that is supported by sources that are external to us.

Evidence can be divided into two major categories.

One category of evidence is **Factual Evidence**.

Factual evidence consists of "potentially verifiable statements that describe real object or events."

Factual evidence is divided into subcategories.

Statistics give mathematical summaries of large numbers of individual pieces of data

Verbal Examples give detailed descriptions of specific cases, instances, or situations.

These instances are often illustrations that are descriptive of a larger concept.

Descriptive Historical Statements simply report an event or occurrence.

They are generally less detailed than verbal examples.

A good example would be eyewitness type testimony.

Another category of Evidence is **Expert Opinion Evidence**.

Expert opinion evidence interprets the meaning of facts.

Expert opinion evidence draws conclusions from facts.

General tests of Data

Internal Consistency: Is the data consistent with other data from the same source?

External Consistency: Is the data consistent with data from other sources?

Relevancy [*cf. the fallacy of Non Sequitur*]: Is the data relevant to the claim?

Best available Data: Is the data the best possible quality?

e.g., primary -v- secondary sources

Specific tests of Factual and Expert Opinion Evidence

Recency: Is the evidence based on recent observation?

In most cases the more recent the better.

In some cases contemporaneous evidence, even if older, would be more appropriate.

Source Identification: Is the source of the evidence clearly identifiable?

Evidence by definition needs an external source.

To evaluate the quality of the evidence we must often evaluate the source

Source Ability: Is the source able to report or interpret the information accurately?

Considerations that might be relevant here include the source's access, position, expertise, experience, and training.

Avoid the "Halo Effect."

Source Willingness: Can the source be trusted to report information objectively?

Considerations that might be relevant here include bias from self-interest, organizational interest, and a writing style that might sacrifice accuracy.

Context: Is the evidence being used in a manner consistent with the meaning and intent of the source?

Specific tests for the quality of Statistical Evidence

These tests center on the use of **appropriate methodology**.

Were **proper sampling techniques** used?

Was the **appropriate statistical unit** used?

Do the statistics cover an **appropriate time period**?

Are **comparable units** being compared?

Specific tests for the quality of Premises

We often forget to test the quality of Premises, but it should be done.

Premises may be tested from three perspectives

The **Philosophical** perspective is concerned with discovering the reasons why a premise is accepted.

The **Pragmatic** perspective is concerned with the effects of applying the premise in specific situations.

The **Consensual** perspective is concerned with whether a consensus of popular or expert opinion supports the premise.

Actual tests of premises include:

Are the terms used in the premise **clearly defined**?

Is an **appropriate rationale** provided to justify the judgment expressed?

Does accepting the premise **result in good**?

Are more **important premises sacrificed** by accepting the premise?

Is the premise **widely accepted**?

Do subject area **experts support** the premise?

REASONING PROCESS

Deductive Reasoning

The text defines deductive reasoning as “the analytic process used in moving from generalities to structurally certain conclusions.”

The text discusses deductive argument in terms of the *structure* of the argument (the **syllogism**) and in terms of the *content* of the argument.

The truly defining characteristic of deduction is that the *structure* of the argument results in a *necessarily certain conclusion*.

The basic structure of a Deductive argument is the **syllogism**.

Syllogisms have three elements.

Syllogisms have a **Major Premise** (a generalization), e.g., "All men are mortal."

Syllogisms have a **Minor Premise** (a specific case), e.g., "Socrates is a man."

Syllogisms have a **Conclusion** (follows from the premises), e.g., "Socrates is mortal."

Syllogisms contain three terms.

The **Major Term** occurs in the major premise and the conclusion, e.g., "mortal."

The **Minor Term** occurs in the minor premise and the conclusion, e.g., "Socrates."

The **Middle Term** occurs in the major premise and the minor premise, e.g., "man."

A properly structured syllogism is said to be "**valid**."

A structurally certain conclusion is said to be "**entailed**."

A syllogism can be "valid" without being "**sound**," i.e., both valid and *true*.

Remember that the *structural relationships* between the terms in the premises determine if the syllogism is valid.

The Categorical Syllogism

General form:

All A is B

C is A

∴ C is B

Example:

All men are mortal.

Socrates is a man.

Therefore Socrates is mortal.

Tests:

The middle term must be “distributed” (i.e., used in a universal or unqualified sense) in at least one premise.

For a term to be universal in the conclusion, it must be universal in the premises.

(Particular premises justify only particular conclusions.)

At least one of the premises must be an affirmative statement.

If one premise is negative, the conclusion must be negative.

Terms must be used with the same meaning throughout the syllogism (cf. the fallacy of *equivocation*).

All A are B, C is B, C is A is invalid.

The Disjunctive Syllogism

General form:

Either A or B

~ A

∴ B

Example:

Either Elvis is alive or Elvis is dead.

Elvis is not alive.

Therefore Elvis is dead.

Tests:

The alternatives presented in the major premise must be mutually exclusive.

The alternatives presented in the major premise must be exhaustive.

If the minor premise affirms (or denies) one alternative the conclusion must deny (or affirm) the other.

The Pure Hypothetical Syllogism

General form:

If A then B
If B then C
 \therefore If A then C

Example:

If I work hard I will get a promotion.
 If I get a promotion I will get a raise in pay.
 Therefore if I work hard I will get a raise in pay

Tests:

The conditional ("if-then") relationship must be universal
 The proper relationship between the component terms of the syllogism must be maintained.

The Mixed Hypothetical Syllogism (ZK simply calls this the Hypothetical syllogism.)

The mixed hypothetical syllogism comes in two forms.

Modus Ponens (from the Latin *ponere*, meaning "to affirm")

General form:

If A then B
A
 \therefore B

Example:

If Shakespeare wrote Hamlet, then Shakespeare was a great writer.
 Shakespeare wrote Hamlet.
 Therefore Shakespeare was a great writer.

Tests:

The conditional ("if-then") relationship must be universal
 Cannot affirm the consequent

Modus Tollens (from the Latin *tollere*, meaning "to deny")

General form:

If A then B
 \sim B
 \therefore \sim A

Example:

If you do a strenuous workout you sweat.
 You're not sweating.
 You didn't do a strenuous workout.

Tests:

The conditional ("if-then") relationship must be universal
 Cannot deny the antecedent

In terms of content, the text identifies two types of deductive argument.

Causal Generalization argument

Description:

"The argument from causal generalization applies an assumed or inductively established causal relationship to specific cases or classes."

Syllogistic format would be pure or mixed hypothetical.

Tests:

Might intervening factors preclude an expected cause and effect relationship? [NOTE: In some cause-effect relationships, the cause always produces the effect (e.g., given oxygen and a temperature of 451° F, dry paper will burn), in others the cause only sometimes produces the effect (e.g., a weather front only sometimes produces rain). You can make a cause and effect argument using either type, but the argument will be deductive only if the cause always produces the effect.]

Is the cause sufficient to bring about the effect?

Might the cause result in other unspecified effects?

Sign argument

Description:

"The argument by sign is based on the assumption of a substance-attribute relationship. This assumption suggests that every substance (object, event, person, for example) has certain distinguishing characteristics or attributes (size, shape, sound, color, and the like) and that the presence or absence of either the substance or the attribute may be taken as a sign of the presence or absence of the other." (e.g., where there's smoke [attribute] there's fire [substance])

Syllogistic format would be pure or mixed hypothetical.

Tests:

Are the substance and the attribute invariable indicators of the presence of each other (i.e., is the sign **infallible**)? [NOTE: There are both fallible and infallible signs. You can make a sign argument using either type, but the argument will be deductive only if the sign is infallible.]

Are sufficient signs presented?]

Are contradictory signs adequately considered?

NOTE: As discussed above, these two types of argument can be *either* inductive or deductive.

NOTE: As far as content for deductive argument goes, this list is *not exhaustive*.

Inductive Reasoning

The text definition of inductive reasoning is "the synthetic process used in moving from particulars to probable conclusions."

Note: The *truly* defining characteristic of induction is that the nature of the argument results in a conclusion that is only *probably true*.

Inductive arguments are best described by the *content* of the argument.

Argument by Example (Generalization)

Description:

"The argument by example examines several specific cases in a given class and assumes that if the known cases are alike with regard to a specific characteristic, then other unknown cases in the same class will exhibit the same characteristic."

Tests:

Are the examples typical?

Are negative instances [counter-examples] adequately accounted for?

Have a sufficient number of examples been examined?

Argument by Analogy

Description:

"The argument by analogy examines a limited number of specific cases, usually only two, and compares their essential features. If the compared cases are alike in all known essential characteristics, it is assumed that they will be alike with regard to a characteristic known in one case but unknown in the other."

Tests:

Are the compared cases alike in all essential [i.e., important and relevant] characteristics?

Are the compared characteristics accurately described?

Argument by Causal Correlation

Description:

"The argument by causal correlation examines specific cases, classes, or both in order to identify a functional correlation between particular elements." (By "functional correlation" we mean that if certain phenomena are consistently correlated (occur together in regularly patterned ways), then we are justified in inferring that there may well be a cause and effect relationship that links the phenomena.)

NOTE: Argumentation theorists and logicians distinguish between two different types of cause, a necessary cause and a sufficient cause. A cause is termed a "necessary" cause if the effect cannot occur in the absence of that cause (e.g., oxygen is necessary for a fire to occur). A "sufficient" cause is one that is, in itself, enough to cause the effect to occur, even though the effect might occur under other circumstances as well (e.g., getting caught robbing a bank is sufficient to get a person charged with a felony, but other actions could get a person charged with a felony as well).

Tests:

Mills Canons:

Method of Concomitant Variation: If two elements vary in a consistent and patterned manner, a cause and effect relationship may be inferred.

Method of Agreement: If the same phenomenon occurs in two or more different situations which have only one other element in common, one is probably a cause of the other.

Method of Differences: If a phenomenon occurs in one situation and not in another, and the two situations are similar in all other ways but one, then one of the differences is probably a cause of the other.

Is the association between alleged cause and alleged effect consistent?

Is the association between alleged cause and alleged effect strong?

Do the alleged cause and alleged effect occur in a regular time sequence?

Is the association between alleged cause and alleged effect coherent (i.e., consistent with other, related data)?

CASE STRUCTURES

General Principles for Affirmative Strategies:

1. Affirmative case strategies should attempt to limit the Affirmative burden of proof.
2. Affirmative case strategies should be able to absorb as many Negative attacks as possible.
3. Affirmative case strategies should be designed to allow the Affirmative to maintain an aggressive posture throughout the debate.

General Principles for Negative Strategies:

1. The Negative should have a clear philosophical position from which to argue.
2. Negative attacks should be broad in scope and probing in nature.
3. Negative strategies should be constructed to allow for more focused and deeper attacks later in the debate.

Case Strategies for Propositions of Judgment

Affirmative

Criteria Establishment Case

Emphasizes the Frame of Definition

Focuses on justification of the definitions/criteria to be used as the basis for judgment

Used when the definitions/criteria have not been firmly established or have not been fully accepted

Criteria Application Case

Emphasizes the Frame of Existence of Fact

Focuses on whether the criteria have been met in the current situation

Used when the criteria/definitions are firmly established and commonly accepted; the only real question is are they met?

Stasis Formula Case

Emphasizes the Frames of Definition, Existence of Fact, and Quality

Focuses on justifying the criteria to be used, showing that they are met, and that no extenuating circumstances exist which would mitigate against accepting the proposition

Used when the audience has limited knowledge of the controversy or when the debater is unsure about the nature of the attacks forthcoming from the opposition

Negative

Rejection of Criteria

Emphasizes the Frame of Definition

Argues that (and is used when) the criteria selected by the Affirmative are, for some reason, unacceptable

Denial of Application

Emphasizes the Frame of Existence of Fact

Argues that (and is used when) the Affirmative criteria are not met in the particular situation in question

Extenuating Circumstances [Establishment of an Alternative Value Hierarchy]

Emphasizes the Frame of Quality

Argues that (and is used when) additional information not considered by the Affirmative should affect judgment in this situation, or that alternative values not discussed by the Affirmative create objections to the proposed judgment

Case Strategies for Propositions of Policy

Affirmative

Traditional/Need Case

Emphasizes the Stock Issues of Ill, Blame, Cure, and Cost

Focuses on showing the existence of a significant problem, the cause of which is inherent in the Status Quo, but that the cause of the problem, and thus the problem itself, can be eliminated by the Affirmative plan at a reasonable cost

Used when the Status Quo is incapable of solving the problem, and when the ill & the cause of the ill can be eliminated by the Affirmative plan

Comparative Advantages Case

Emphasizes the Stock Issues of Cure and Cost

Focuses on the characteristics of the Affirmative plan and how those characteristics result in advantages not achievable by the Status Quo

Used when: a) no major problem exists but conditions could be improved, b) neither the Status Quo nor the Affirmative plan can entirely solve a problem, but the plan can do a better job, or c) both the Status Quo and the Affirmative plan can solve a problem, but the plan will result in other advantages not available within the Status Quo

Goal/Criteria Case

Emphasizes the *Stases* of Definition and Existence of Fact

Focuses on identifying a goal which either has been or, it is argued, ought to be accepted by the Status quo and then showing that the Affirmative plan achieves that goal better than the Status Quo.

Used when a) the goal/objective of the Affirmative plan is already accepted by the Status Quo and therefore does not need to be defended or, b) the Affirmative wishes to identify a new goal/objective the Status Quo *ought* to be pursuing and then argues that the Affirmative plan achieves that goal better than could the Status Quo.

Effect Oriented Case

Emphasizes the Stock Issues of Ill, Blame, and Cure, *but de-emphasizes* Blame when developing the Cure

Focuses on presenting a plan which will alleviate the ills of the Status Quo without eliminating the cause of those ills

Used when it would be impossible/undesirable to eliminate the basic cause of the ill

On Balance Case

Emphasizes the Stock Issue of Cost

Focuses on maximizing the value of solving or avoiding a problem by pointing out that the costs of solving/avoiding the problem (i.e., adopting the Affirmative plan) are minimal

Used when the harms to be avoided are small, or hard to quantify, or chance possibilities, or future possibilities

Negative**Defense of the Status Quo**

Emphasizes, the Stock Issue of Ill, but can discuss any of the Stock Issue areas

Argues either that there is nothing significantly wrong with the current system, or at least that the current policies are, all things considered, the best possible under the circumstances

Used when existing policies can be shown to be working and/or when alleged failures can be denied or shown to be temporary or unavoidable

Minor Repairs to the Status Quo

Emphasizes the Stock Issue of Blame

Argues that the implementation of the present system could be improved but that no fundamental change is needed

Used when the cause(s) of the current problems can be shown not to be inherent and, thus, to be repairable

Straight Refutation

Emphasizes the concepts of Presumption and Burden of Proof

Argues that the Affirmative analyses/positions/claims are wrong

Used when the Negative is unable or unwilling to commit either to the present system or to specific alternatives

Counterplan

Emphasizes the Stock Issue of Cure and Cost

Argues that the Negative proposal will better solve the serious ills which exist or that it will do at least as good a job with less cost than the Affirmative proposal

Used when the Negative is unwilling to commit to the current system

Establishing that the adoption of the Affirmative proposal would create significant **disadvantages** is an important and very effective element of a Negative attack on the Affirmative case. Disadvantages are the undesirable consequences that, it is argued by the Negative, would follow from implementation of the Affirmative proposal. (This type of attack is perhaps more common with policy propositions, but "value objections" in a Judgment debate amount to the same thing.) In order to prove the existence of a disadvantage the Negative must establish four elements.

- 1) The external link is the element of the case that serves as the initial cause of the disadvantage.
- 2) The internal link is the chain of cause and effect reasoning that ties the initial external link to the ultimate impact.
- 3) The impact of a disadvantage is the ultimate harmful consequence.
- 4) The uniqueness of a disadvantage stems from the idea that the Affirmative proposal and only the Affirmative proposal will create the harmful impact.

For best results, your disadvantage arguments must be presented clearly. Use the four-part formula suggested in the text for maximum clarity.

- 1) State the disadvantage claim
- 2) Explain why the disadvantage uniquely flows from the Affirmative proposal.
- 3) Describe the external and internal causal links.
- 4) Describe the impact of the disadvantage.

REFUTATION

The text defines refutation as "the process of attacking the arguments of an opponent in order to weaken or destroy those arguments."

Doing refutation involves: a) finding and exposing weaknesses in your opponent's arguments, and/or b) altering the audience's perception/interpretation of your opponent's arguments.

Weaknesses in arguments come from: **a)** errors in the use of data, and/or **b)** errors in the nature of the reasoning used.

Errors Related to Use of Data

Assertion: No data is presented in support of a claim

General tests of Data

Internal Consistency: Is the data consistent with other data from the same source?

External Consistency: Is the data consistent with data from other sources?

Relevancy [cf. the fallacy of Non Sequitur]: Is the data relevant to the claim?

Best available Data: Is the data the best possible quality?

e.g., primary -v- secondary sources

Specific tests of Factual and Expert Opinion Evidence

Recency: Is the evidence based on recent observation?

In most cases the more recent the better.

In some cases contemporaneous evidence, even if older, would be more appropriate.

Source Identification: Is the source of the evidence clearly identifiable?

Evidence by definition needs an external source.

To evaluate the quality of the evidence we must often evaluate the source

Source Ability: Is the source able to report or interpret the information accurately?

Considerations that might be relevant here include the source's access, position, expertise, experience, and training.

Avoid the "Halo Effect."

Source Willingness: Can the source be trusted to report information objectively?

Considerations that might be relevant here include bias from self-interest, organizational interest, and a writing style that might sacrifice accuracy.

Context: Is the evidence being used in a manner consistent with the meaning and intent of the source?

Specific tests for the quality of Statistical Evidence

These tests center on the use of **appropriate methodology**.

Were **proper sampling techniques** used?

Was the **appropriate statistical unit** used?

Do the statistics cover an **appropriate time period**?

Are **comparable units** being compared?

Specific tests for the quality of Premises

We often forget to test the quality of Premises, but it should be done.

Premises may be tested from three perspectives

The **Philosophical** perspective is concerned with discovering the reasons why a premise is accepted.

The **Pragmatic** perspective is concerned with the effects of applying the premise in specific situations.

The **Consensual** perspective is concerned with whether a consensus of popular or expert opinion supports the premise.

Actual tests of premises include:

- Are the terms used in the premise **clearly defined**?
- Is an **appropriate rationale** provided to justify the judgment expressed?
- Does accepting the premise **result in good**?
- Are more **important premises sacrificed** by accepting the premise?
- Is the premise **widely accepted**?
- Do subject area **experts support** the premise?

Errors Related to Reasoning

Fallacy: An argument that is *psychologically persuasive* but which proves, upon examination, *not* to be *logically adequate* because its' premises do not logically imply the conclusion; in other words, an argument whose conclusion *could* be false *even if* all its' premises were true.

A partial list of generally recognized fallacies is presented below.

Fallacies of Relevance

Arguments that rely on premises that are not logically relevant to the conclusion; in other words, arguments that ask for acceptance or rejection of a claim based on inappropriate grounds.

Non Sequitur: (it does not follow) Presents an argument in support of a claim that is, in fact, irrelevant to the claim.

Ad Verecundiam: (to authority) When the premises of an argument appeal to the authority of a generally respected source, but one which has no legitimate claim to authority on the matter currently in dispute, as justification for accepting a claim.

Ad Misericordiam: (to pity) When an arguer appeals to sympathetic feelings on the part of the listener as justification for accepting a claim.

Ad Hominem: (to the person) When an argumentative attack is directed not at the arguments (the reasoning and/or conclusions) of an opponent, but at the person of the opponent.

Ad Ignorantiam: (to ignorance) When it is argued that a claim is true on the grounds that it has not been proved false, or when it is argued that a claim is false on the grounds that it has not been proved true.

Ad Populum: (to the people) When an argument appeals to a) the emotions/prejudices of the audience or b) to popular opinion as sufficient justification for accepting a claim.

Ad Baculum: (to "the stick," to force) When it is argued that the listener should accept a claim or else unpleasant consequences will follow.

Ignoratio Elenchi (literally "ignorance of refutation," missing the point) Presenting an argument that proves a claim other than the one actually at issue.

Genetic Fallacy: Arguing that an idea should be accepted or rejected based on the nature of the people or group(s) that originated or that support the idea. (Ad Verecundiam is a special case of this fallacy.)

Straw Man: Misrepresents an opponent's position in order to make it easier to attack, and then attacks the misrepresentation.

To Tradition: When it is argued that a claim should be accepted based on the fact that this has been the traditional belief/policy; that "this is the way we've always done it."

Accident: Applies a generalization to an individual case that the generalization does not properly govern.

Fallacies of Insufficient Evidence:

Arguments that provide no support or too little support for the claim being presented.

Begging the Question: (traditionally called "Petitio Principii," literally "requesting what is sought") Assumes the truth of a claim as an element of the argument supporting the claim.

False Analogy: Compares evidence and conclusion cases that are not alike in significant respects or that have significant differences.

Hasty Generalization: Draws a conclusion about a population based on too few or atypical examples.

Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc: (after this, therefore because of this) An assumption about cause/effect relationships that mistakes chronological succession for a causal sequence.

Composition: Assumes that what is true of a part of a larger whole or of a member of a population is therefore true of the entire whole or of the total population.

Division: Assumes that what is true of an entire whole or of a total population is therefore true of the individual parts of the whole or of the members of the population.

Slippery Slope: Assumes that one event will necessarily lead to a continuing series of events and that these events will inevitably lead to some (usually undesirable) outcome.

Fallacy of the Continuum: (an ancient name for this was the "fallacy of the beard") Assumes that small differences are always unimportant and therefore that different things or positions connected by a series of small intermediate steps cannot be distinguished.

Plurium Interrogationum: (many questions) The traditional definition of this fallacy is asking a question that has another question or an assumption about the answer to another question buried in it (e.g., have you stopped taking drugs?). In debate, it can also mean asking an opponent so many questions they cannot all be answered, even though each question implies a problem with the opponents' position.

Fallacies of Language:

Arguments in which the meanings of words or terms are manipulated.

Equivocation: Uses different meanings of the same word or phrase during the course of an argument.

Ambiguity: Using a word or phrase that can be interpreted in two or more different ways without making clear which meaning is intended.

Accent: Implying an unwarranted conclusion by placing improper or unusual emphasis on a word, phrase, or element within an argument. Also surreptitiously shifting emphasis among elements within an argument. (Taking a sentence or phrase out of context would be a special case of this fallacy.)

Amphiboly: Exploits ambiguity in meaning that results from poor or awkward grammatical structure.

Special Methods for Altering the Audience's Perception of Opponents' Arguments

Exposing Inconsistencies: Your opponents' arguments must be consistent within themselves.

Minimizing: Make ideas or arguments favorable to your opponents appear insignificant.

Maximizing: Make ideas or arguments unfavorable to your opponents appear highly significant.

Reducing to absurdity: Extend your opponents' analysis until the conclusion is absurd or in some way unacceptable.

Denying Inherency: Argue that problem(s) identified by the Affirmative are not fundamental components of the current system.

Identifying Irrelevancies: Just as data must be relevant to the claim, arguments must be relevant to the contention.

Establishing Dilemmas: Reduce the opposition argument to two alternatives, both of which are unacceptable.

Turning the Tables: Argue that an argument presented by your opponent actually supports your position.

Assessing Probabilities: Argue that the negative impacts (harms or disadvantages) asserted by your opponents are unlikely, whereas the negative impacts you have identified are more likely.

Defining Time Frames: Argue that the negative impacts you have identified are more immediate or more long-term, and so deserve attention, whereas the negative impacts identified by your opponents are more remote or temporary, and so deserve less attention, if any.

For best results, use the following guidelines in refutation.

Be selective in refutation:

You generally don't need to, and usually don't have time to, refute all of your opponents' arguments.

Focus refutation on those arguments most likely to have an impact on the audience.

Focus refutation on those arguments that seem most relevant to the important issues in the case.

Focus refutation on those arguments that seem to have the most substance (don't get distracted by trivialities).

Remember to leave time to rebuild and strengthen your own case.

Prepare refutation in advance:

Brief out responses to arguments you anticipate your opponents might use

Use a clear refutation format:

Use the four-part formula suggested in the text for maximum clarity.

- 1) Name the argument to be refuted.
- 2) State your position on the argument being attacked.
- 3) Support your position with reasoning and/or evidence.
- 4) Explain the importance of your refutation argument to the issue/contention under consideration.

Take careful notes to help determine what arguments warrant refutation:

Flow Sheets are a good form of note taking for debate.

Record each speech in the debate in a separate vertical column on the page. Use different colors for Affirmative and Negative speakers if you like. (Some debaters and judges record different types of arguments on different flow sheet pads. That may be more advanced than you will want to get in this class, but the choice is up to you.)

Take notes in outline form. (This helps to distinguish the major arguments from the less important arguments.)

Record responses directly (horizontally) across from the arguments they are intended to answer.

Record evidence as well as claims whenever possible. (It will help you to be better able to evaluate the evidence.)

DEBATE FORMATS

Note: Times listed are *maximum* speaking times.

Note: Arguments may be introduced only in Constructive speeches. *No new arguments may be introduced in Rebuttal.*

TEAM VALUE DEBATE [Adapted from the Cross Examination Debate Association format (cross-examination eliminated, speaking times altered to fit class period).]
Preparation time available to each side: 5 min.

1st Affirmative Constructive (7 min.)

Duties: Develop basic outline of the entire Affirmative case (Frame of Definition & Existence of Fact)

1st Negative Constructive (7 min.)

Duties: Present Negative position/philosophy
Present initial attack on Affirmative position (Frame of Definition & Existence of Fact)
Present Negative case for why the Proposition is not true, if desired.

2nd Affirmative Constructive (7 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Affirmative case in light of Negative refutation
Extend Affirmative analysis with additional argument and evidence
Attack Negative case if presented

2nd Negative Constructive (7 min.)

Duties: Present "value objections" (disadvantages of accepting the judgment ["value choice"] reached in the Proposition.) These arguments primarily fall under the Frame of Quality

1st Negative Rebuttal (3 min.)

Duties: Rebuild 1st Negative argument with additional argument and evidence
Respond to 2nd Affirmative Constructive arguments

1st Affirmative Rebuttal (3 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Affirmative case in light of Negative refutation
Respond to the value objections presented in 2nd Negative Constructive
Respond to the case arguments presented in the 1st Negative Constructive
Extend Affirmative analysis with additional argument and evidence

2nd Negative Rebuttal (3 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Negative case with additional argument and evidence
Focus the debate for the Negative

2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (3 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Affirmative case with additional argument and evidence
Focus the debate for the Affirmative

TEAM POLICY DEBATE [Adapted from the American Forensic Association "National Debate Tournament" format (cross-examination eliminated, speaking times altered to fit class period).]
Preparation time available to each side: 5 min.

1st Affirmative Constructive (7 min.)

Duties: State proposition and definitions
Develop basic outline of the entire Affirmative case (Ill, Blame, Cure, and possibly Cost)

1st Negative Constructive (7 min.)

Duties: Present Negative position/philosophy
Present initial attack on Affirmative position (usually concentrating on Ill & Blame)

2nd Affirmative Constructive (7 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Affirmative case in light of Negative refutation
 Extend Affirmative analysis with additional argument and evidence
 Attack Negative philosophy and arguments

2nd Negative Constructive (7 min.)

Duties: Attack Affirmative case where the 1st Negative didn't (usually Cure and Cost)

1st Negative Rebuttal (3 min.)

Duties: Rebuild 1st Negative argument with additional argument and evidence
 Respond to 2nd Affirmative Constructive arguments

1st Affirmative Rebuttal (3 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Affirmative case with additional argument and evidence
 Respond to Negative arguments from 2nd Negative Constructive and 1st Negative Rebuttal

2nd Negative Rebuttal (3 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Negative case with additional argument and evidence
 Focus the debate for the Negative

2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (3 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Affirmative case with additional argument and evidence
 Focus the debate for the Affirmative

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE FORMAT [Adapted from the National Forensic Association
 "Lincoln-Douglas" format (cross-examination eliminated, speaking times altered to fit class period).]
Preparation time available to each side: 3 min.

Affirmative Constructive (6 min.)

Duties: Present arguments to justify the Proposition
 For a Policy Proposition use the Stock Issues (Plan is usually de-emphasized).
 For a Value Proposition focus on the Frame of Definition, Existence of Fact, and, if desired, Quality.

Negative Constructive (7 min.)

Duties: Refute Affirmative case
 Offer disadvantages/value objections to the Affirmative proposal

1st Affirmative Rebuttal (4 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Affirmative case in light of Negative refutation
 Extend Affirmative analysis with additional argument and evidence
 Attack Negative arguments
 Last chance for the Affirmative speaker to make *new* arguments

1st Negative Rebuttal (5 min.)

Duties: Extend key arguments from Negative Constructive with additional argument and evidence
 Respond to Affirmative arguments
 Focus the debate for the Negative

2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (2 min.)

Duties: Rebuild Affirmative case in light of Negative refutation
 Extend Affirmative analysis with additional argument and evidence
 Attack Negative arguments
 Focus the debate for the Affirmative