

SPED 330 People With Disabilities: Social Discrimination and Oppression; The Social, Political and Cultural Realities of Living as a Person With a Disability.

Instructor: Thomas J. Neuville
Office: Gerhart #11
Telephone: 717-871-4880
E-mail: Tneuvill@millersville.edu

Course description:

This course is designed to introduce students to many important themes that are at the core of social construct as it applies to disability. The underlying premise for this course is that disability must be viewed from a socio-political perspective. Such a perspective contends that people with disabilities are disadvantaged in society, not so much because of their particular impairments, but because of the way society defines and responds to their condition.

The course exposes students to various models and theories of disability and in particular to the concepts of devaluation and oppression. Looking at disability through a human rights perspective will shed new light upon the ways in which disability disadvantage has similar roots to the oppression of racial, cultural and ethnic minorities, women, gays and lesbians and other disadvantaged social groups. It will be argued that many current responses to disability (at the individual, program and policy levels) reflect negative assumptions about people with disabilities and, therefore, rather than being of benefit, have often served to deepen their oppression. The course seeks to provide a framework for critically examining the assumptions that have shaped societal responses to people with disabilities and for exploring what alternative assumptions and responses might be.

This course seeks to reflect the experience of people with disabilities, highlighting both the social roots and the impacts of discrimination, exclusion and rejection as well as responses of resistance, advocacy, empowerment and cultural liberation. Students will be exposed to material that may be emotionally laden and should bring to the course an openness to new perspectives and a willingness to explore their own beliefs and values.

A variety of teaching methods will be used, including lectures, discussions, debates, in-class group exercises, videos, and guest speakers. There will be a heavy emphasis on student participation. Full class attendance is expected.

Mission of the Special Education Department

Prepare educators to facilitate an empowered and unified P-12 learning community to be successful in the world of people through respect, collaboration, mutuality and the realization of each individual gift.

All members of the Millersville University's Professional Education Unit will create learning communities of inquiry and action, focus on students, and demonstrate exemplary professional practices.

- 1. Learning Communities of Inquiry and Action:** We will engage in learning communities in which reflection, collaboration, lifelong learning, and habits of mind are developed and nurtured.
- 2. Focus on Students:** We will balance knowledge and the principles and concepts delineated in professional and state standards with an appreciation of all students' individuality, diversity, and cultures.
- 3. Exemplary Professional Practices:** We will demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of exemplary professionals. We will have strong competence in our content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills as delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. We will demonstrate professional dispositions or standards of conduct, will be supportive of students, families, and the school and community, and will serve as catalysts for positive and responsible change.

To view the full text of the Conceptual Framework, visit the School of Education web page linked to Millersville University's web page.

Course objectives:

Upon Completion of the course, the student will be able to:

1. Investigate disability as a complex social status and personal identity issue.
2. Examine narrative accounts of disability experience, disability scholarship, disability activism and disability culture.
2. Develop multiple perspectives about disability beyond the medical model. (If you desire, add the rest of that sentence) which reduces disability to a condition of illness or impairment.
3. Apply the basic theoretical perspectives introduced to analyze selected disability issues.
4. Implement social models and theories of disability as a framework for critically analyzing the experiences of, and societal response to, people with disabilities.

5. Demonstrate authentic relationship to interact with people with disabilities beyond the client role.

6. Participate with individuals with disabilities in both professional and personal contexts and reflect upon and evaluate the interactions.

Assigned readings

Required Texts

Longmore, Paul & Umansky, Laura, editors (2001). The New Disability History. New York university Press, New York.

Your readings for the course are drawn both from the course reader and from several articles accessed directly on the Internet. For every topic addressed in the course, you are responsible for all of the **primary** readings, as detailed on the course schedule. In addition, you should choose and read one of the **supplementary** readings indicated for each topic. Plan to review the primary readings each day before class. The readings are an integral part of the course – you will need to keep up in order to participate in the class discussions and to successfully complete your written assignments.

Assignments and Evaluation

<i>Due Date</i>	<i>Assignment</i>	<i>Grade%</i>
	Debate Presentation	10
	Take-Home Weekend Assignment	25
	Final In-Class Written Assignment	25
	Final Essay -- Outline and Bibliography	10
	Final Essay	30
		100

Comprehensive Outline of Course Content and Textbook Chapters:

- I. Disability History: from the Margins to the Mainstream.
 - a. Disability and the Justification of Inequality in American History
 - i. Western political thought and inequality between persons or groups.
 - ii. Historic function of disability as a justifier of inequality.
 - iii. Importance of disability as part of mainstream historical study.
 - iv. Political history as a demonstrator of the ubiquity of disability in social thought.
 - v. History and use of the concept of normality.
 - vi. Disability and justification of slavery.
 - vii. Historic intersection of race and disability.

- viii. Suffrage in the U.S. and disability as a weakness.
 - ix. Disabled as undesirable immigrant.
 - x. Social exclusions and the use of medical science.
- b. “Speech Has an Extraordinary Humanizing Power: Horace Mann.
 - i. Sign language as a signifier of cultural inferiority.
 - ii. Horace Mann public education and the path from manualism to oralism.
 - iii. From home signs to American Sign Language and the development of culture.
 - iv. Language and the hope of separate but equal.
 - v. Understanding people through diverse communication behaviors.
 - vi.
 - c. This Unnatural and Fratricidal Strife: A Family’s negotiation of the Civil War.
 - i. Disability and the rejection of valued social roles.
 - ii. Familial expectation and birthright denial.
 - iii. Family control and the development of the individual.
 - iv. Death-making and the acceptance of death as a viable alternative to disability.
 - v. Rejection and denial of freely given relationships.
 - d. Try to idle: Work and Disability.
 - i. Work and disability.
 - ii. Separation of the person from their disability.
 - iii. The person as passive recipient.
 - iv. Value and meaning and the rhythms of life as a person with a disability.
 - v. Isolation and the expectations of a hidden personhood.
 - vi. Cross purpose body construction and social expectation by nineteenth century ideology.
 - vii. Illness as a means of self definition.

II. Redefinitions and Resistance.

- a. A Pupil and a Patient: Hospital Schools in Progressive America.
 - i. Rehabilitation and vocational training.
 - ii. “Crippledom” as a serious social and economic problem.
 - iii. Eugenics and the formation of the social conscious.
 - iv. Defining disability in scientific terms and the creation of the medical model of treatment.
 - v. Employment as the best solution to the problem of disability.
 - vi. Correction of the individual as the dominant strategy.
 - vii. Physical and moral failings and placing blame on the individual.
 - viii. Moral degeneration, worthlessness and the development of pity to support the charitable industrial complex.
 - ix. Cripple as dependent.
 - x. Temporary institutions as permanent repositories.

- b. Cold Charity: Manhood, Brotherhood, and the Transformation of Disability, 1870 – 1900.
 - i. Exploitation of ones disability for profit.
 - ii. Charity as a social contract.
 - iii. Vulnerability and coming out to strength based communities.
 - iv. Social decisions to care for or offer alternative valued social roles.
 - v. Reliance on caretakers as a main focus.
 - vi. Distancing and the building of “homes of care”.
 - vii. Valued contribution and the expectation of failure.
- c. The Outlook of the Problem and the Problem of the Outlook: Two Advocacy Journals Reinvent Blind People in Turn-of-the-Century America.
 - i. Lessons from the history of people who are blind.
 - ii. The radical expectation of dignified and useful lifes.
 - iii. Social movements and the professionalization of advancement.
 - iv. Challenging long held values and the development of disability identity.
- d. Reading Between the Signs: defending deaf Culture.
 - i. Development of schools, education and deaf culture.
 - ii. Disability culture in it’s infancy.
 - iii. Educational theories and scientific measurement.
- e. Medicine, Bureaucracy, and Social Welfare: the Politics of Disability.
 - i. Distribution of wealth and social welfare.
 - ii. Reducing disability to a numeric measuremnt.
 - iii. Rejection of disability as a moral issue.
 - iv. Impact of world wars on social treatment of people with disabilities.
 - v. The emergence of laws.
 - vi. Creation of state and federal rules and regulations, the problems intended to solve, assumptions based on, and impact on people.
 - vii. Strengthening of formal systems and the decline of informal relational structures.
- f. Helen Keller and the Politics of Civic Fitness.
 - i. Assessment of who is fit for civic life.
 - ii. Separation of those who serve and those who are served.
 - iii. Impact of the culturally dominant assumption of a relationship between paid employment and good citizenship.
 - iv. Roots of the politicalization of disability.
 - v. Expectations of emotional and intellectual functioning.

III. Images and identity.

- a. Martyred Mothers and Merciful Fathers: Exploring Disability and Motherhood.

- i. The cultural interpretations that frame physical and mental conditions.
 - ii. Dilemmas surrounding children with disabilities and their families.
 - iii. Euthanasia and people with disabilities.
 - iv. The language of dehumanization.
 - v. Person with a disability as social menace.
 - b. Blind and Enlightened.
 - i. Holy innocent and the burden of positive stereotypes.
 - ii. Equality and inclusion as fundamental principles in the disability rights movement.
 - iii. Independence, self-respect and knowledge as power.
 - c. Seeing the Disabled: Visual Rhetorics of Disability in Popular photography.
 - i. Images that establish long held disability prejudices.
 - ii. Images we live with every day.
 - iii. Sentimentality, pity and the money raising advantages.
 - iv. The campaign to surround popular culture with positive images.
 - d. American Disability policy in the Twentieth Century.
 - i. IDEA, ADA, NCLB and other laws masquerading as civil rights laws.
 - ii. Laws and the Disability Rights Movement in the public mind.
 - iii. Overcoming burden based policy.
- IV. Current Disability Movement and Cultural Thought: Selected Readings from: Ingstad, Benedicte & Reynolds-Whyte, Susan (1995). Disability and Culture. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA. Search conducted for most current literature.
 - a. Disability culture
 - i. Definition and characteristics as defined by members.
 - ii. Media evidence of cultural presence.
 - iii. From incurable illness to human in control.
 - b. Children with disability and the need for inclusion.
 - i. Educational values and the tools of inclusion.
 - ii. Sports and the open conspiracy to hold separate.
 - iii. Social transformation and strategies of starting with the young.
 - c. Social movements and world leaders.

- i. ADAPT and other Disability Rights Movement organizations.
- ii. Leaders with disabilities around the world and their actions.
- iii. What dominant ideologies have to gain from inclusion and knowledge of disability cultures and experience.
- iv. Future trends and emerging issues.

Assignment Guidelines

All assignments other than those completed in class must be typed. Minimum and maximum page length guidelines must be followed. Points may be deducted for essays that are significantly shorter or longer than specified. Documents should be double-spaced, with 1 in. margins on all sides. Assignments **must** be submitted electronically, via e-mail, as attachments in either Microsoft Word, Microsoft Works or WordPerfect formats.

Essays must cite all sources using proper APA style.

For all assignments, you must pay careful attention to spelling and grammar and ensure that your essay is well organized and structured. Points will be deducted for poor presentation including such things as poor spelling or grammar; incorrect citation; inadequate margins; etc.

Assignment Descriptions

1. Debate Presentation

For this assignment, you are asked to work with a team to develop, prepare and present a position on a specified controversial topic related to disability. For the purpose of the debate, you will be assigned to either the "pro" or "con" side. Each group will select from amongst their group, the two students who will be their debating team. While only two people per team will debate, everyone is expected to participate in the preparation. In your debate presentation, your team must take and defend the assigned position, *presenting arguments that support your position and refuting the arguments on the other side of your position.*

For this assignment you are expected to draw on the course material and readings. Your topic assignment sheets will point you to several sources relevant to your topic. You are not required to undertake additional research, although you may do so if you wish.

Goal:

To apply the theoretical perspectives presented in this course to your examination of a controversial issue, and to develop and demonstrate your awareness of both sides of this issue.

Evaluation Criteria:

- Demonstrated understanding of both sides of the issue
- Effective utilization of relevant course material in the analysis of this issue
- Clarity of presentation; organization and structure of presentation
- Teamwork

- Adherence to the rules of Debate (<http://debate.uvm.edu/meanyparli.html>). Attached to syllabus.

For this assignment, you will be asked to select any one of the debate topics and prepare a short paper (1200 to 1800 words) applying what you have learned about the social model to the question posed by this topic. This assignment will require some research beyond the assigned course readings.

This short paper must include the following elements:

- Introduction. In one paragraph, identify your topic, then state the position that you hold on this topic and the principle arguments that support your position.
- Social Model Analysis. In one or two paragraphs, explain how a social model analysis supports or contrasts with the position you have taken on this issue.
- Controversies. In one or two paragraphs, identify and examine where you feel there may be problems or weaknesses in your own argument, or in the social model analysis you have advanced.
- Research. Identify two external sources from Ryerson's online collection that are relevant to your topic. One of these must be a scholarly source; the other can be scholarly, narrative or popular. Write one or two paragraphs about each of these sources, identifying the nature of the source (scholarly or otherwise) and explaining how the perspective presented in this article or text proceeds from a predominantly social or medical model analysis. Discuss how each of these sources either challenges or supports your argument.

Goals:

To deepen and consolidate your understanding of a fundamental course concept --

To develop familiarity with periodical indexes, databases and research guides and to refine skills in scholarly research.

Evaluation Criteria:

- Demonstrated understanding of a social model analysis of disability.
- Effective identification and use of relevant research.
- Clarity of presentation; organization and structure.
- Adherence to specific instructions and requirements for the assignment.

2. Final Essay Outline

Before you begin to write your final essay for this course, you are asked to produce a two or three page outline of your topic, thesis, principle arguments, and research sources.

This outline must include the following elements:

- Essay Topic. You may choose a topic from the list provided, or submit an alternate topic for approval. If you choose an alternate topic, do not proceed to write your outline, until this topic has been approved.
- Essay Thesis. In one or two sentences, set out the position you will be taking relative to your topic, and/or the arguments you intend to advance.
- Outline of Major Points. Very briefly, highlight the building blocks for your argument or exposition. Set out the four or five key details of the evidence you are considering, and the arguments you will use to develop your thesis. Remember that your essay should be a coherent presentation with a clear logical structure -- use this

section of your outline to develop that structure.

- Annotated Bibliography. Identify six sources that you intend to draw from in your research for this paper, at least 5 of which must be from scholarly literature. Three of your sources can be drawn directly from your course reading list. For each of your three external sources (those not from the course readings list) write a short paragraph describing the article or text, identifying the author's thesis, noting the perspective it is written from and explaining exactly how and why it will be useful in developing your thesis. In other words, justify your selection, from the vast body of research available and relevant to your topic.

Goals:

To assist in focusing final essay topic, argument and sources. To ensure the development of a clear, appropriate and manageable research thesis.

Evaluation Criteria:

- Critical engagement and reflection.
- Appropriate use of scholarly sources.
- Clarity of presentation, organization and structure.
- Originality.
- Adherence to specific instructions and requirements for the assignment.

3. Final Essay

For this assignment, you will be asked to select a topic that is related to the objectives of this course and to prepare an essay of 6-8 single-spaced pages (3000-4000 words). A number of possible topics will be provided; if you wish to choose a different topic, you are welcome to do so, provided that you gain approval first.

What is most important in this essay is that you go well beyond description and focus primarily on critical analysis. **A research essay must have a point of view.** Without a thesis or "controlling argument", your essay will be merely descriptive, or will summarize the various articles that you have read without demonstrating your understanding or independent analysis. Remember as well that the emphasis in this course is on reflection and analysis, rather than rehabilitation strategies or intervention techniques.

Take care to follow the advice provided in feedback received on your essay outline.

Please note that utilizing an external (or internal) resource involves more than merely mentioning it. Remember that the research process requires careful scrutiny and attention -- evaluate the reliability of all sources cited, and avoid the pitfalls of improper citation and plagiarism. Be sure to review carefully, the primary readings identified for the Library Orientation and the Essay Writing segments of the course.

Goal:

To provide an opportunity for independent learning on a selected topic related to the course and to enhance understanding of the theoretical perspectives presented in this course by applying them to the analysis of the particular issue. Also, to develop and demonstrate skills in critical analysis.

Evaluation Criteria:

- Ability to apply course theories and concepts to the critical analysis of a disability-related issue.
- Depth of analysis and reflection.
- Significant and appropriate use of external sources.
- Clarity of presentation, organization and structure.
- Originality.

4. Final In-Class Written Assignment

At the conclusion of this course, you will be asked to write a short paper detailing your reflections, observations and learning from the assigned readings, lectures, presentations and class exercises. This assignment will be completed in class, and will require you to make substantial and explicit reference to the assigned readings and draw on the concepts in such a way as to demonstrate your understanding of the material. Two or three specific questions will be provided to prompt and guide your reflections.

Goal:

To demonstrate your understanding of the fundamental concepts introduced in this course and your ability to apply these concepts to your own experience.

Evaluation Criteria:

- Depth of critical reflection
- Demonstrated understanding of course material
- Active effort to connect challenging ideas with personal experience
- Thoroughness of review
- Clarity of presentation, organization and structure.

Course Grading:

A = 94 – 100%

A- = 90 – 93 %

B+ = 87 – 89 %

B = 84 - 86%

B- = 80 – 83 %

C+ = 77 – 79 %

C = 74 – 76%

C- = 70 – 73 %

D = 65 – 69 %

F = 64% or lower

COURSE MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Students must keep a copy of each assignment on file until the original has been marked and returned (in case the original should happen to get lost.) As well, students are required to keep copies of their “working papers” and all earlier drafts. From time to time, students submit essays in which there is some question as to whether the material submitted represents their own independent work. In such cases, the student will be asked to provide such evidence, including handwritten notes, earlier drafts, etc. Students may also be interviewed on the content of their essays.

Plagiarism is a form of theft and is considered a serious offence. It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes plagiarism. If you are in any doubt about this, please consult with the course instructor directly. Plagiarism can lead to consequences as serious as expulsion from the course or the program. Students should be aware that all required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to **Turnitin.com** (given MU membership) for the detection of plagiarism.

Students are expected to hand in assignments on time. Unless an extension has been agreed to (see below), there will be a penalty for late assignments. For every three days that an assignment is late, the grade will be marked down one “notch”, e.g. from an A to an A-, from a B- to a C+). Assignments that are more than 10 days late (without an extension) will receive an automatic F. Please note that since assignments can be submitted electronically, all days, including Saturday and Sunday, will be included in this calculation.

If for some serious reason, a student is unable to hand in an assignment on time, it is possible to negotiate an extension. Such **extensions must be arranged before the due date for the assignment.** Requests for extensions must be submitted in writing or by e-mail, outlining the reasons for the request and the amount of extra time required. Do not assume that an extension has been granted unless you have received explicit agreement from the course instructor.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

by

Robert Branham
Professor of Rhetoric & Director of Debate
Bates College

and

John Meany
Director of Forensics
Claremont McKenna College

Spring, 1998

Debating has long been a vital part of American education. Training in debate improves valuable analytical and speaking skills, and enables the discussion of important issues, whether scientific, historical, religious or political. It contributes to the intellectual and ethical development of its participants by challenging them to make defensible judgments in which they must critically investigate complex issues, question given assumptions, evaluate the reliability of data and consider alternative perspectives. Debate stimulates and refines communication skills that empower individuals to speak for themselves, to discover and use their own voices. But most students debate because it is also fun. Debating provides a unique intellectual challenge and excitement, as Malcolm X reflected in his *Autobiography*:

Standing up there, the faces looking up at me, the things in my head coming out of my mouth, while my brain searched for the next best thing to follow what I was saying, and if I could sway them to my side by handling it right, then I had won the debate--once my feet got wet, I was gone on debating.¹

Academic debate takes many forms, some highly specialized and others less formal, some that emphasize research and prepared arguments, and others that stress extemporaneous speaking and analytical skills. Parliamentary debate has long been the predominant form of competitive academic debating in most English-speaking nations. It is now the most widely practiced type of intercollegiate debate in the United States and many American secondary and middle schools have also begun to develop parliamentary debating programs. This guide explains the formats and procedures of parliamentary debate for use in classes, public debates, and competitive tournaments.

Based loosely on the deliberative discussions of the British House of Commons, parliamentary debate is lively and audience-oriented. The House of Commons, unlike the U.S. Congress, permits no written speeches from its members. Similarly, no speeches, briefs, or quotations are read in parliamentary debates.

The debaters speak extemporaneously in parliamentary competition, using only the notes they have made during the debate and preparation period.

Parliamentary debate differs from other forms of competitive debate in several additional ways. Parliamentary debates are more oratorical, witty, and accessible to general audiences. They are shorter than traditional policy debates, making them well-suited to classroom use. Parliamentary debates have relatively few rules; they feature less jargon and fewer theoretical arguments. The rules of parliamentary debating are primarily designed to ensure that debates are evenly matched and enjoyable. Because parliamentary debating is less technical than other forms of debate and easier to learn, most students are able to begin debating in this format almost immediately.

Formats

The specific formats, rules and conventions of parliamentary debating vary in different nations and leagues.² One of the virtues of parliamentary debate is its flexibility. Speaking times, numbers of speakers, judging and other elements of the debate format may be altered to accommodate particular needs and purposes.

In competitive parliamentary debating, each round of debate has a different topic announced just before the debate begins. The amount of preparation time varies, allowing from ten minutes to (in British secondary school tournaments) one hour of preparation between the announcement of the topic and the beginning of debate.³ Fifteen minutes is the most common allotment.

During preparation time, the participants analyze the proposition and outline their major arguments. They ask themselves: What does this proposition mean? What important issues are raised by it? How may it be affirmed or denied? What examples and events are relevant to its discussion? The answers to these and other questions will serve as the foundation for the government case and prepare the opposition for its refutation. Some tournaments and competitive leagues permit the use of dictionaries, texts and other prepared materials during preparation time. Others limit or even prohibit coaching and use of prepared materials prior to the debates.

The first speaker for the proposition must use some of the preparation time to organize the main issues of the case into a logically complete and persuasive form to convey the best possible impression of the their case. The first speaker therefore uses preparation time to arrange the essential elements of the case into a brief outline. The argument outline should clearly bring the major elements of the case into relation with each other and constitute a complete case on behalf of the motion.

A standard American tournament format for parliamentary debate consists of six speeches:

First proposition constructive speech 7 minutes

First opposition constructive speech 8 minutes

Second proposition constructive speech 8 minutes

Second opposition constructive speech 8 minutes

Opposition rebuttal 4 minutes

Proposition rebuttal 5 minutes

The speakers for the proposition (sometimes called the government), open and close the debate in defense of the motion. Unlike other forms of American team debate, parliamentary debate features just one rebuttal per side. The rebuttal is given by the first constructive speaker for each team.

The presiding officer of each debate is the Chair, or Speaker of the House (usually a judge or moderator). The Speaker of the House manages the debate, recognizes the speakers, and rules upon any disputes that arise in the course of the round.⁴ The Speaker introduces each debater in turn. There is no preparation time between speeches. After one speech is finished, the Speaker of the House calls upon the next debater to proceed.

In most American tournament debating, there are two persons on a team, with one person on each team speaking twice. Public debates often feature three-person teams, with a different person giving each speech in the debate. Three-person teams allow more people to participate and provide more variety for audiences.

Topics

Parliamentary debates may either have *set topics*, known days or weeks in advance of the debate, or be conducted extemporaneously. In American parliamentary debating, set topics are used primarily for one-on-one debates between two schools and for public debates, so that the topic can be announced and publicized. Set topics permit advance research, brainstorming and practice debates. In the debates themselves, however, minimal notes are used and no speeches or briefs are read. Written quotations are used sparingly or not at all. Parliamentary tournament debating is generally *extemporaneous*, with a different topic announced a few minutes before each round. ⁵

Most propositions in parliamentary debate begin with either the phrase "Be it resolved that. ." (often abbreviated as "B.I.R.T.") or "This House believes. . ." (or "This House would The "House," unless otherwise specified by the first proposition speaker, refers to the judge(s) and audience attending the debate, who serve as a deliberative parliament. The proposition or topic in a parliamentary debate is usually referred to as the *motion*.

Two types of motions are commonly used in American parliamentary tournament debating: *straight* motions and *linkable* motions.

Straight motions are meant to be debated literally. They may be drawn from current events (e.g., "Be it resolved that the United States should lift its economic sanctions against Cuba"; or "This House would support the admission of Russia to N.A.T.O."), or they may be broader statements of historical judgment or philosophy ("Be it resolved that the American dream has become an American nightmare"; "This House believes that the United States has been more sinned against than sinning"). Some motions require *value comparison* ("This House believes that the local is preferable to the global"; "This House despises flattery more than slander"). Such debates rely upon examples to prove or disprove the proposition, but the proposition itself is still the focus of the debate. In motions used for tournament competition, the proposition team is sometimes permitted to choose which side of a given issue it will defend (e.g., "The United States should/should not extend Most Favored Nation trade status to China"). Their choice is announced at the beginning of the debate.

Linkable motions need not be debated literally, but may instead be linked to specific policy proposals selected by the government team and not known by the opposition until the first constructive speech is heard. A linkable motion may be drawn from a pithy quotation ("B.J.R.T. It is better to die on one's feet than to live on one's knees") or a song lyric ("B.I.R.T. freedom's just another word for nothin' left to lose"). The proposition team may define the terms of the motion in most any way they choose, generally linking the abstract motion to some specific controversy through the use of metaphors. For example, the last topic ("freedom's just another word) might be linked to a case statement in favor of restoring the eligibility of legal immigrants (who came here seeking "freedom") for welfare benefits (without which, they have "nothin' left to lose"). The topic "it is better to die on one's feet might be linked to the case statement that "the United States should not extend Most Favored Nation status to China," arguing that America should "stand up" for its principles rather than remaining on its knees to placate China.

The link between the motion and case is often quite loose, although some leagues and tournaments insist upon tight links. Topicality arguments, common in other forms of American competitive debating, are highly unusual in most parliamentary debating leagues, in part because they are regarded as less interesting than talking about the issues of the case. On the other hand, as the authors of the English-Speaking Union's guide to secondary school debate in Great Britain explain, "intelligent and straightforward definitions are expected and rewarded" by adjudicators.⁶ In parliamentary debate, the linkable motion is generally less important than the case, which must provide the basis for a good, evenly matched, debate.⁷

Speaker Style and Responsibilities

Although adjudicators of parliamentary debates generally pay more attention to content and strategy than to style, speaking skills do receive more attention in parliamentary debate than in most other forms of debate competition. Good parliamentary debaters speak at a rate of speech comprehensible to the layperson untrained in debate. Physical and vocal delivery, humor, passion and persuasiveness are important elements of parliamentary debating. A parliamentary debater should maintain eye contact with the audience and develop a speaking style that is fluent and expressive.

Parliamentary debaters do not read written speeches, briefs, or evidence. Instead, parliamentary debaters speak from a few notes that record the arguments that other speakers have made in the debate and outline their own main points. Each of these points should be signposted, explained, supported by relevant facts and examples, and given impact. Because there is no preparation time between speeches, parliamentary debaters must learn to think on their feet, adding and elaborating upon arguments while speaking.

Each speaker position in parliamentary debate also involves specific responsibilities for the discussion of the motion.

First speaker, proposition

The opening speaker establishes the framework for the debate and establishes a logically complete case for the proposition. This involves an expository presentation in which the speaker may define any ambiguous terms of the motion, interpret the motion through a clear case statement, offer a history of the issue in controversy, and disclose any limitations for the discussion. After such preliminaries, the first speaker should state and support the main arguments of the case.

Interpretation of the motion. The motion should mean the same thing to all participants in the debate. To that end, the proposition team has the responsibility to clarify the ground for debate by defining any distinguishing, technical or ambiguous terms of the resolution. Debates in which ambiguous terms are not clearly defined in the opening speech often go astray, lacking clash and clarity. A debate on welfare reform, for example, in which the opening speaker failed to explain what the government meant by 'welfare' (food stamps or farm subsidies?) and 'reform' (abolish, reduce or expand?), for example, would probably be a waste of time. Clear definitions permit clear debate.⁸

In addition to defining any unclear terms of the motion, the first speaker should offer a concise *case statement*. The case statement should plainly express the government's interpretation of the motion in one sentence, such as "federal income tax should be set at a flat rate" or "high schools should not conduct warrantless searches of student lockers." The wording of the case statement is very important; it will frame the discussion and determine the relevance of arguments. It should be carefully transcribed by all participants in the debate. Once presented, the case statement may not be changed.

The case statement should clearly advance a controversial claim, capable of affirmation and denial, susceptible to proof and disproof. The case statement can be based on a narrow construction of the motion or an understanding that is creative, unusual or enterprising. Any narrow construction should have a link to the resolution or serve as an appropriate analogy for the motion. In support of the motion, "This House would expand N.A.F.T.A.," for example, the government might define "This House" as the government of Chile and "expand N.A.F.T.A." as the adoption of internal economic reforms likely to secure Chile's admission in the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Here is an example of how the first proposition speaker might provide definitions and case statement for the motion, "This House would further restrict free speech":

We support the motion, "This House would further restrict free speech." By "free speech." we mean currently legal expressions that vilify groups of involuntary association (that is, race, gender, and ethnicity). We believe that public high schools in the United States should adopt hate speech codes prohibiting speech that vilifies groups or individuals on the basis of their race, gender or ethnicity.

The government must, at the beginning of the debate, define the motion and provide a clear and debatable statement of their position.

Providing Opposition ground. The duty of the proposition team is to provide the basis for a good debate. The first speaker must accordingly present a case that is highly debatable. This requirement is very different from other forms of competitive debating, in which the affirmative team attempts to secure a strategic advantage by devising a case that is so strong and so obscure that the other side will have nothing of consequence to say against it. In parliamentary debate, however, this approach is unacceptable.

The first proposition speaker must provide a case against which there are strong and principled arguments. Some interpretations of a motion do not provide for effective debate. The government's interpretation must not constitute a *truism*, a claim (e.g., "Murder is reprehensible") that no reasonable person would oppose. In parliamentary debate, the opposition may argue that a given case is not sufficiently debatable. The second proposition speaker is then expected in the next speech to demonstrate that strong opposition arguments do exist, or else lose the decision.

Moreover, *the case must not require specific knowledge to debate.* Because there is no opportunity to research the case topic prior to the debate, cases must concern issues with which the opposition could reasonably be expected to be familiar, or sufficient background information must be provided at the beginning of the first proposition speech to make strong Opposition possible.

Burden of proof

In most debates, the first proposition speaker supports the motion by advocating something new, challenging established ideas, or attempting to settle an issue in public controversy. It is the obligation of the person who affirms the motion to prove the case. In a criminal court case, the defense may file a motion for dismissal if the prosecutor has failed to provide a well-substantiated case for conviction. Similarly, the first speaker for the proposition has the burden of establishing a case for the motion. As Raymond Alden explained in his 1900 treatise on *The Art of Debate*, there is an "obligation resting upon one or other parties to a controversy to establish by proofs a given proposition, before being entitled to receive an answer from the other side." This responsibility rests, he concluded, "upon the side that would be assumed to be defeated if no progress at all were made in the consideration of the case."⁹ The government's burden of proof is met through the presentation and support of its major arguments, or case.

The case.

The first proposition speaker should establish interest in the motion and case through an introduction. The introduction should demonstrate the timeliness of the case, perhaps by recounting a recent story or contemporary context for the controversy. A case for the abolition of **capital punishment** might be **introduced by recounting** the story of a recent or pending execution, for example. The introduction should persuade the judge and audience that the issue is of importance and interest to them.

After providing necessary definitions and a clear case statement, the first proposition speaker should outline from two to four major points in support of the case statement. Each of these points should be signposted as clearly and concisely as possible. Each point should be fully explained and supported by examples, complete in itself and distinct from the other main issues. In support of the motion, "This House believes that good things come to those who wait," for example, the government might argue that the "good thing" is the burial, after seven decades of waiting, of the body of Vladimir Lenin. Lenin's preserved corpse has been on public display in Moscow since his death in 1924. In order to make this case debatable, the first speaker would be expected to provide sufficient background information.

To support the case statement that Russia should bury Lenin, the government might offer three main points. By burying Lenin, Russia will:

- I. Bury an obsolete symbol of the communist past;
- II. Save the enormous expense of storing the body; and
- III. Fulfill Lenin's own wishes for the disposal of his remains.

Each of these points would be supported with reasoning, facts, stories and

illustrations. The first proposition speaker should also explain why each of these arguments is significant; why, for example, it is important that one should have control over the disposition of one's own body after death.

In support of the motion, "This House would abolish capital punishment," the first speaker might offer the following major points:

- I. The death penalty fails to deter crime;
- II. Innocent people are executed; and
- III. Capital punishment is discriminatory by race and class.

The first speaker should offer a complete and compelling case for the motion. The opening speech should be concluded by a restatement or summary of the main points of the case.

First speaker, opposition

The duty of the opposition is to provide clash, promoting a choice between the proposal advanced by the proposition team and some other course of action or position. The Opposition should make clear why the motion before the house should be defeated.

The job of the Opposition in extemporaneous debate is very challenging. When a linkable resolution is used, the opposition will often have no idea of what the proposition team's case will be until the first speaker begins. But the Opposition's job is made easier by the requirement that the proposition team advance a case that provides strong and principled ground for the opposition. If the proposition team has met its burden, the opposition should be able to discover good arguments on first hearing the case.

The Opposition speaker may choose to contest the definitions or case statement that the government has established for the debate. If these are not disputed in the first Opposition speech, they are presumed to be tacitly accepted for the remainder of the debate. Definitions should only be disputed when the fairness and debatability of the proposition are at stake. Debates that center on definitional disputes are almost always less enjoyable than those that center on the issues of the case.

The first opposition speaker attempts to weaken or nullify the case for the proposition, usually by refuting the main points of the case. This is called *direct refutation*. The Opposition analyzes the first proposition speaker's arguments, pointing out logical fallacies, factual inaccuracies or inconsistencies in the main lines of proof. The first Opposition speaker should also identify any of the common errors of case construction that the proposition team has committed, including ignored exceptions to case examples, the improper combination of

arguments, and overdrawn conclusions.

The opposition is not obliged to dispute or disagree with every argument, or even every main point, of the proposition team's case. In fact, many debaters miss important Opportunities for winning arguments because they feel compelled to negate each of the ideas their Opponents introduce. It may be to the advantage of the opposition to agree with or concede one or more elements of the proposition team's case. An opposition speaker may choose to agree with an argument by the team defending the proposition in order to simplify or focus the discussion on more salient issues, to reveal a contradiction or inconsistency, or to use an argument from the proposition side to support the opposition's position. A speaker should, however, address the vital issues of the other side, whether by strategically agreeing with them or contesting them.

Although the Opposition often defends existing policies against the proposition team's proposal for change, the first Opposition speaker may choose to present a *countercase*, defending a new course of action mutually exclusive with that presented by the proposition.¹⁰ The countercase is often designed to address a problem area identified in the case. For example, on the topic, 'This House believes in pacifism,' the proposition team might support a position of complete military nonintervention. Rather than defending current patterns of military intervention, the Opposition might instead defend a position of limited or conditional intervention -- supporting intervention only against overt acts of territorial aggression or only in cooperation with multilateral Organizations, for example. The countercase is not a defense of current national security policy, nor is it compatible with the proposition team's complete prohibition of military intervention. The proposition team's case maintains a universal principle of nonintervention, while the opposition case allows selected use of military intervention. The countercase is designed to resolve many of the examples of bad military intervention cited in the proposition case and to provide the Opposition's own worthy exceptions to the motion.

Second speakers, proposition and opposition

The second (also called 'member') constructive speeches for each side have similar responsibilities. They should effectively refute the important arguments of the opposing side and amplify the strong arguments initiated by their colleagues. The member speeches are the last for each side in the debate in which new arguments and issues may be introduced.

The member speakers should concentrate on sustaining the core arguments for their side. The second speaker for the proposition should advance the main lines of the case presented in the opening speech so that they cannot be convincingly disputed in the remaining speeches. To this end, the second proposition speaker should refute all important objections presented by the preceding opposition speaker and provide new examples or other forms of additional support for the main points of the proposition team's case.

The second speaker for the opposition may support the objections of the first

Opposition speaker, present additional objections, defend and expand the opposition's counter case if one has been presented, and evaluate inconsistencies between the arguments of the first and second proposition speakers. For both second speakers, the primary duties are extension and amplification--ensuring that all major issues for both sides have been covered and that the important arguments for their side have been expanded with additional support.

Rebuttals

Most good debates are won or lost in the rebuttals. The rebuttals are the summary speeches for each side of the debate, the last opportunity each side will have to explain why they should win. Rebuttals are a final opportunity to contrast the major positions and philosophies of the proposition and opposition. Skilled rebuttalists in parliamentary debate do not attempt to cover every minute issue that has been discussed in the debate, but rather to deal in depth with those issues that will have a substantial bearing on the decision to uphold or defeat the motion. The shorter time of rebuttal speeches necessitates selectivity. Rebuttalists should paint the "big picture" of the round, sorting out the decisive issues from those that are less important.

New arguments may not be introduced in the rebuttal. Arguments presented in the rebuttal must have a foundation in the constructive speeches. The proposition rebuttalist is entitled to answer new arguments made in the second opposition speech, because the final rebuttal is the first Opportunity that the proposition team has to refute these issues.

The opposition has the first rebuttal speech. This speech should offer an effective summation of the main issues of the debate, demonstrating how important points for the opposition undermine support for the motion. The opposition rebuttalist should carry through important issues from the constructive speeches, illustrating the significant dimension of each issue in qualitative or quantitative terms. The opposition should generally avoid "putting all its eggs in one basket" by offering several independent reasons to reject the motion.

The proposition has the final speech in the debate. This speech should summarize the entire debate from the perspective of the proposition, focusing the discussion on a group of powerfully unified ideas. The final rebuttalist should extend the important arguments from the constructives, offer multiple, independent proofs of the motion, and contrast the main arguments of the Opposition with those in favor of the motion.

Points

In parliamentary debate, a debater may rise to make a point while another person is speaking. There are three types of points that may be made: *points of order*, *points of personal privilege*, and *points of information*. Points of order and points of personal privilege are rarely used and should be reserved for important

violations of debate protocol. Points of information are a regular part of most parliamentary debates and are much more common than the other two.

Points of order.

One may rise to a point of order when a member of the other team has violated the rules for debating. There are few rules in parliamentary debate, so a point of order is usually called only when (1) an opponent has introduced a new argument in rebuttals or (2) an Opponent has gone significantly Overtime.

A point of order is addressed to the Speaker of the House. The person making the point rises from his or her seat, interrupts the person speaking, saying, "Madame/Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order," and then states the violation. The clock is stopped while the point of order is under consideration. In most parliamentary competition, a point of order is not debatable; the Opposing team is not permitted to comment upon it. **11** The Speaker of the House rules immediately upon the completion of the point and says, "Point well taken," "point not well taken," or "point taken under consideration," if no immediate ruling is possible. The Speaker of the House may take the results of the point of order into account in their deliberations, penalizing the team or speaker that has committed the violation.

Points of personal privilege.

A debater may rise to a point of personal privilege during an opponent's speech when his or her position or argument has been seriously misstated by the Opposing speaker. A point of personal privilege is addressed to the Speaker of the House, who then rules upon it. A point of personal privilege is not debatable.

Points of information.

Points of information are a dynamic and enjoyable part of parliamentary debate. They take the place of the cross-examination periods used in other American debating formats. Unlike cross-examination, however, points of information are raised *during* the speech of the person questioned. The point of information is a brief rejoinder (fifteen seconds or less) to the point then being made by the person speaking. It may be a concise statement or a pointed question. A point of information is also sometimes used for purposes of clarification. Unlike the point of order or personal privilege, the point of information is directed to the person speaking rather than to the Speaker of the House.

To make a point of information, the debater rises, faces the person speaking and signals his or her desire to speak. either verbally (saying, for example, "Point of information, Madame/Mr. Speaker!" or "And on that point, Madame/Mr. Speaker") or nonverbally, by holding a hand out. The person speaking may then allow the point to be stated or refuse to take the point. If the person speaking declines your point, you must sit down. If recognized, you make the point and then sit down.

The speaker then responds to the point and continues her or his speech. Points of information are not permitted during rebuttals. Nor are they allowed during the first or last minute of any constructive speech. The timekeeper should offer a signal (using a bell or a knock on the table, for example) at the end of the first minute and at the beginning of the last minute of each constructive speech. Points of information are permitted only between these two signals.

Each constructive speaker in the debate should both offer and accept points of information. A speaker who declines to accept any points may seem to fear the opponent's arguments. On the other hand, a speaker who accepts too many points of information loses control of his or her speech. Usually, a constructive speaker will accept two or three points of information. Points of information are an integral part of parliamentary debating. The English-Speaking Union's guidebook explains that "offering points of information, even if they are not accepted, shows that you are active and interested in the debate. Accepting them when offered shows that you are confident of your arguments and prepared to defend them. A team that does neither of these is not debating."¹²

Types of Cases

There are several distinct types of cases in parliamentary debate. Some are similar to those used in other forms of debate, others are quite different. Because the proposition team is given great latitude in its selection of cases, debaters have the opportunity to discuss issues of particular interest for them, whether drawn from current events, sports, popular culture, literature, science, history or ethics, for example. So long as the case provides the basis for a good debate, the proposition team on a linkable motion may talk about virtually anything. The most common forms types of cases used with linkable motions are these:

Current national or international policy controversies

Russia should be admitted to N.A.T.O.

The U.S. should end its embargo of Iran.

Nepal should close Mt. Everest to climbing.

Local controversies of broader interest

Dade County, Florida should permit concerts by Cuban musicians.

The Eye of the Needle (a 200-foot natural sandstone arch in Montana destroyed by vandals) should not be repaired.

Sports and popular culture disputes

Baseball should eliminate the designated hitter.

Vinyl records are better than compact disks.

Literary cases

You're Cinderella. Don't marry the prince.

You're Dorothy. Don't go back to Kansas.

Personal decisions

You should not eat meat.

You're the parent of a five year-old boy. Don't buy toy guns for him.

Time-space cases

Time-space cases stipulate an alternative identity for the adjudicator (as a specific person, group, or Organization) and an alternate time and/or place at which the debate is conducted.

It's August 6, 1945, and you're Harry Truman. Don't drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima.

It's June 1936 and you're Franklin Roosevelt (or, alternatively, the U.S. Olympic Committee). Boycott the Berlin Olympics.

When debating a time-space case, the participants must restrict themselves to arguments based on what was known at that time and not on later events. A debate on the Hiroshima topic, for example, could not include the fact that the war would end within two weeks of the bombing. Similarly, the Olympics debate could not include details that only became known after the specified date, such as the number of medals that African American track star Jesse Owens would eventually win in the 1936 games. Time-space debates must be restricted to what was known at the time and, if an individual persona (such as Harry Truman) is assigned to the judge, to the attitudes and interests of that historical figure. Time-space cases are used both in competitive parliamentary debates and as a classroom exercise for the discussion of historical events and figures.

Floor Speeches

In public parliamentary debates and in the final rounds of tournaments, floor speeches by members of the audience are sometimes permitted between the constructives and rebuttals. A floor speech is a brief address (often limited to one minute) offered in support of the proposition, the opposition, or some third position (a "cross-bench" speech).^{~3} At the conclusion of the constructive speeches, the speaker of the house calls for speeches from the floor. The speaker of the house may begin by asking for a floor speech in favor of the government, then ask for one in favor of the opposition, and continue to

alternate. The speaker of the house may close the floor after a certain number of speeches have been delivered for each side, or after some set period of time (usually ten or fifteen minutes). The speaker of the house then calls upon the opposition rebuttalist to begin.

Good floor speeches are limited to a single important point. The floor speaker may address some point that has already been raised in the debate, or introduce a new point that has not been raised in the constructive speeches. The rebuttalists should take important points raised in the floor speeches into account, respond to them when necessary and use them when possible. Floor speeches add a great deal to debates. They permit more people to participate and increase the diversity of perspectives on issues considered. They are a good **Opportunity** for novice debaters to offer brief speeches (a less intimidating prospect than being asked to deliver a full-length debate speech) and for experienced debaters to think about what *one issue* could win the debate for their side. They transform passive listeners into active participants in the debate, more attentive and engaged during the principal speeches.

Public Debates

In an increasingly polarized and fragmented society, more individuals need the opportunity to engage each other and contest ideas about the common good. By participating in public debates, students may promote community discussion of controversial issues and encourage democratic participation and expressions of difference in the public sphere.

Public debates may be held in schools, primarily for audiences of students and teachers, or at non-academic sites in the community for wider audiences. Parliamentary debate, with its combination of issue analysis, rhetorical skill, humor, and lively interaction, is enjoyable for general audiences. The debate format helps frame the discussion of current controversies and educates audiences in different ways of approaching social and political concerns.

A good public debate will promote the desire of those attending it to speak for themselves about the issues raised. The standard parliamentary debate format is easily modified to include public participation in the discussion. Public parliamentary debates often provide an opportunity for floor speeches from the audience between the constructives and rebuttals. Some public debates feature questions from the audience or open discussion after the debate.

Public debates can become an important forum for communities with few existing opportunities for public expression. They also encourage student participants to consider community perspectives on issues and to adapt their own persuasive appeals to community interests and concerns.

REFERENCES

1 Malcolm X (with Alex Haley), *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (New York: Grove Press, 1965), 184. See also Robert Branham, "I Was Gone on Debating":

Malcolm X's Prison Debates and Public Confrontations," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 31 (Winter, 1995), 117-137.

2 In Canada, the leader of the opposition gives the second opposition constructive speech and the rebuttal. In British tournaments, there are four different two-person teams in each debate, two defending the proposition and two opposing it.

3 Most American parliamentary tournaments provide fifteen minutes of preparation time.

4 In some debate leagues, it is the Speaker of the House who announces the topic once the debaters have arrived in the room where the debate will be held. The Speaker then times the preparation period.

5 Some British secondary school tournaments, such as those sponsored by the English-Speaking Union, feature several rounds of debate, some with set topics drawn from a list of possible resolutions announced in advance of the tournament, and at least one round of extemporaneous debates, in which students have one hour to prepare after the topic is first announced.

6 Trevor Sather, *The Schools Mace 1997-98 Official Handbook* (London: English-Speaking Union, 1997), 17.

7 Parliamentary debate tournaments sometimes issue two topics for each round, one linkable resolution and one straight resolution. The government team may choose between these two, with their choice of resolutions announced at the beginning of the debate.

8 Robert Branham, *Debate and Critical Analysis* (Hill sdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1991), 38-41.

9 Raymond Alden, *The Art of Debate* (New York: Holt, 1900), 61-62.

10 Branham, *Debate and Critical Analysis*, 150-176.

11 This rule is not applicable in the National Parliamentary Debate Association, prominent in the Western United~States, in which many judges permit the disputation of points of order.

12 Trevor Sather, *The Schools Mace 1997-98 Official Handbook* (London: English-Speaking Union, 1997), 14.

13 The Speaker of the House usually recognizes cross-bench speakers after floor speeches for the Opposition and proposition have been completed. Cross-bench speeches do not support either of the two sides in the debate, but instead

support some third position or perspective. In a debate in which the proposition team argued for lifting all economic sanctions against Cuba and the opposition supported keeping current sanctions in place, for example, a cross-bench floor speaker might support a partial or conditional lifting of sanctions.