

Coach's Clinic

C1. Valuing Values: An Introduction to the Structures of LD

Dan Meyers & Joe Vaughan

A copy of the handout can be found on Joe Vaughan's webpage
at <http://www.scarsdaleschools.k12.ny.us//Domain/159>

Or scan the QR code below to go to the page



© Original Artist

Reproduction rights obtainable from

www.CartoonStock.com



"Can we ask you to not wear that T-shirt Bill?"

Search ID: amc0441

What is LD?

- Proposition of Value, not Policy
- Explicit discussion of the decision calculus
- The prevalence of philosophical literature over empirical literature

Introduction to Argumentation

All complete arguments should have the same structure:

- Claim
- Warrant
- Impact

Claim

Domestic violence often escalates over time since the abuser will respond to any threat to her power and thus a premeditated response is necessitated since the time between attacks is the only time available for the victim to formulate an avenue for recourse.

Warrant

Judith Koons explains the escalating nature of domestic violence: "It is at [...] the first physical move toward separation - that a batter[er] is prone to become more violent. A decision - or even a threat - to leave can trigger lethal violence. Because domestic violence is marked by power and control, attempting to exit a room may be considered "disobedience," spurring escalated violence. Resistance strategies (such as leaving a room) may force an abuser "to make his coercive power explicit. Any threat, however small, to the abuser's authority within the family is likely to be met with violence." [...] Killing a battering man may be the safest available alternative."

Types of Claims

- Analytical
- Empirical
- Psychological
- Framework

Why the type of claim matters...

Exercises teaching Claim/Warrant/Impact structure

Impact

Thus, because any action by the victim could be seen as a legitimate threat by the abuser, domestic violence can escalate randomly, further denigrating agency and justifying deliberate deadly force. Furthermore, only affirming can solve for this egregious rights violation since exercising lethal force is the only way to definitely preempt escalation since no one can abuse rights if not alive.

Resolutional Analysis

Types of Resolutions – Comparative, Absolute, Superlative

- November/December 2010 - Resolved: The abuse of illegal drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not of criminal justice.
- 2011 NFL Nationals - Resolved: When forced to choose, a just government ought to prioritize universal human rights over its national interest.
- September/October 2010 - Resolved: States ought not possess nuclear weapons.
- September/October 2011 - Resolved: Justice requires the recognition of animal rights.
- 2003 NCFL Nationals° - Resolved: capitalism is the most justn economic system.

- Finding Definitions
- Contextual Clues and Clauses
 - March/April 2010 - Resolved: In the United States, the principle of jury nullification is a just check on government.
 - March/April 2009 - Resolved: Vigilantism is justified when the government has failed to enforce the law.
 - September/October 2007 - Resolved: A just society ought not use the death penalty as a form of punishment.
- Evaluative Term
 - November/December 2008 - Resolved: In a democratic society, felons ought to retain the right to vote.
 - March/April 2012 - Resolved: Targeted killing is a morally permissible foreign policy tool.
 - November/December 2006 - Resolved: A victim's deliberate use of deadly force is a just response to repeated domestic violence.
 - November/December 2011 - Resolved: Individuals have a moral obligation to assist people in need.
- Actor and Action of the Resolution
- Describing the Affirmative and Negative Worlds

Structure of an LD Round

- Affirmative Constructive (AC) – 6 min
 - The Framework
 - Statement of the resolution
 - Definitions/Observations
 - The Value
 - The Value Criterion/Standard
 - The Contentions
- Negative's Cross Examination (CX) – 3 min
- Negative Constructive/First Negative Rebuttal (1N) – 7 min
 - The Negative case
 - The Negative rebuttal
- Affirmative's Cross Examination (CX) – 3 min
- First Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR) – 4 min
- Second Negative Rebuttal (2N) – 6 min
- Second Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR) – 3 min
- PREP TIME

Flowing (Aff Flow)

AC (3 min)	1N (7 min)	1AR (4 min)	2NR (6 min)	2AR (3min)

Flowing (Neg Flow)

1N (7 min)	1 AR (3 min)	2N (6 min)	2AR (3 min)

Rebuttals

- Responsive! Responsive! Responsive!
- Framework Responses (i.e. arguing about how to argue) vs Contention Level Responses
- The litany of types of responses
- Exercises for teaching rebuttal skills

More Information

- For more information, log into nationalforensicsleague.org and search for “Novice LD Curriculum”
- You can also find videos on the website that discuss
 - All of this material in more depth
 - Topic briefings