

英語ディベート講習会（ジャッジ方法）

Kyushu Debate Workshop (Judging Academic Debate)

英語による教育ディベートの審査方法の講習会を開催します。ディベートの指導者、将来指導してみようという方を含め広く参加者を募集します。講師は世界各地でディベートの指導をしているイリノイ州立大学教授ゾンペッティ博士と同大学ディベート部監督カールソン先生。参加者は今年度の高校生英語論題および来年度前期の大学生英語論題である、ベーシックインカム導入についての模擬ディベートを見学しジャッジをします。

This is a half-day hands-on workshop for prospective teachers of academic debate in schools and universities, focusing on judging. An experienced debate instructor will explain how to judge a formal debate and the participants will watch and try to judge a demonstration debate using this year's high school topic in Japan. Although primarily for instructors, all people interested in debating including high school and college students are welcome.

対象 一般向け、高校生向け、在学生・教職員向け、その他
日時 2017年2月17日（金）13:00～18:10
場所 九州大学伊都キャンパス・センターゾーン2号館2階2205教室（福岡市西区元岡744）
定員 先着30名
参加費 無料
詳細 Debate Judge Workshop for Prospective Teachers and Coaches
sponsored by the Faculty of Languages & Culture
taught by
Dr. Joseph Zompetti, Professor of Communication, Illinois State University (USA)
Ms. Shanna Carlson, Director of Debate, Illinois State University
Mr. Katsuya Koresawa, Hiroshima Shudo University (MA, Illinois State University)

Sessions:

1. 13:00-14:30: Lecture: How to judge debate.
2. 14:50-16:20: Demonstration debate
Resolved: that the Japanese government should introduce basic income.
論題は HEnDA のものから変更していますが、基本は同じです。
3. 16:40-18:10: Post-debate critique.

なお、この講座は九州大学学部生対象の英語ディベート集中講義の一部を公開するものではありません。

問合せ 担当：言語文化研究院 井上奈良彦 電話：092-802-5747
Mail：debate★flc.kyushu-u.ac.jp（※メールアドレスの★を@に変更してください。）
HP：<http://www.flc.kyushu-u.ac.jp/~debate/>

主催・後援

This workshop is sponsored/supported by:
Kyushu University Faculty of Languages & Cultures（九州大学言語文化研究院）
Japan Debate Association Kyushu Chapter
KAKEN Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) (JP26282054)
「議論教育のための対話型教材開発に向けた基礎的研究」
Strategic Hub Area for top-global Research and Education - Kyushu University
「スーパーグローバル大学創生支援」事業

Sample Briefs

Full briefs and other materials are downloadable:

https://archive.iii.kyushu-u.ac.jp/public/aTSMgAFIN44AddAB2IZadjdL6IE9H2AI8_TN0ynoOvOD
(Password: ito-policy2017)

Basic Income Comparative Advantages AC

Observation 1- Inherency

A) Japan's current standard to receive assistance is too strict

Yamamori, 2014 (Yamamori, Toru [Professor at Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan]. "The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income1." *The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Basic Income*. Ed. Yannick Vanderborght and Toru Yamamori., 2014. P. 69-81. Web. <<http://www.basicincome.org/bien/pdf/munich2012/Yamamori.pdf>>.)

The standards above consider the flow of income. However, there is the problem that **during the actual review of applications, household assets are considered**. This in itself is a natural outcome in view of the system's intent. However **it's been pointed out that this standard is extreme in Japan. The limit for bank deposits and savings is set at a month and a half's worth of social assistance**.⁷ Even within the committees of the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare **there have been opinions to the effect that the standard is overly austere**.⁸ Regarding goods, **ownership of anything that isn't found in over 70% of households in the region is, just as, in principle ownership of a car is, unacceptable. The result is that until one is unable to receive social assistance until having lost everything. It has been pointed out that the effect of these conditions is that social assistance does not help recipients rebuild lost livelihoods** (attain "independence" in Ministry terms) **and regain conditions in which they would no longer require assistance**. On the other hand, for the most part citizens with low incomes "carry on consuming patterns on par with the average citizen (Kikuchi[2010],p.105) ," taking on loans rather than coming to apply for assistance. Research on international comparisons reveals that Japan's social assistance standard regarding household assets is among the most austere (Uzuhashi[1999]).

Answers To Basic Income AC

Inherency

Basic Income is inevitable, there is no real barrier to the 1AC

Basic Income Earth Network, 2016 (Anonymous. "Basic income as the monetary policy tool for the 21st century." *Basic income will be at the core of monetary policy in the 21st century*. Basic Income Earth Network, 10 May 2016.)

So **why is it inevitable? Take a look at Japan, and now the eurozone: economies where consumer price deflation has become an ongoing and entrenched reality**. This occurrence has been married to economic stagnation and continued dips into recession. **In Japan** — which has been in the trap for over two decades — **debt levels in the economy have remained high. The debt isn't being inflated away as it would under a more "normal" rate of growth and inflation**. And even in the countries that have avoided outright deflationary spirals, like the UK and the United States, inflation has been very low. **The most major reason, I am coming to believe, is rising efficiency and the growing superabundance of stuff**. Cars are becoming more fuel efficient. Homes are becoming more fuel efficient. Vast quantities of solar energy and fracked oil are coming online. China's growing economy continues to pump out vast quantities of consumer goods. **And it's not just this: people are better educated than ever before, and equipped with incredibly powerful productivity resources like laptops, iPads and smartphones**. Information and media has fallen to an essentially free price. **If price inflation is a function of the growth of the money supply against growth in the total amount of goods and services produced, then it is very clear why deflation and lowflation have become a problem in the developed world, even with central banks struggling to push out money to reflate the credit bubble that burst in 2008**.

Judging Exercises

SCENARIO 1: Both teams have argued well in the debate. One of the arguments the Negative introduced was a Topicality violation. Both sides argue this back-and-forth, including the last Negative speaker (2NR). However, the last Affirmative speaker (2AR) says it is unimportant and does not address the argument specifically. Who should win?

SCENARIO 2: Both teams have argued well in the debate. The Negative team wins that the Affirmative plan is not topical. The Affirmative, however, wins that their case is better than the *status quo*. Who should win?

SCENARIO 3: Overall, the Negative team has arguments that are persuasive and are damaging to the Affirmative. The first Affirmative speech (1AC) has strong evidence in it – evidence that the Affirmative debaters refer to throughout the round. The Negative's arguments, while strong, lack evidence to support them. Who should win?

SCENARIO 4: The Negative's arguments are reasonable, but not overwhelming. The first Affirmative rebuttal (1AR) answers all of the Negative arguments pretty solidly. The 2NR does their best to keep their arguments alive. The 2AR sounds good stylistically, but does not extend or refer to many of their partner's arguments from the 1AR. Who should win?

Rules of Class Debate

1. Resolution: The Japanese government should introduce basic income.

2. Teams and Matching

Affirmative:

Negative:

3. Format of Debate

(1) 1st Affirmative Constructive Speech (1AC)	6 min.
(2) Cross-Examination by the 2NC speaker	3 min.
(3) 1st Negative Constructive Speech (1NC)	6 min.
(4) Cross-Examination by the 1AC speaker	3 min.
(5) 2nd Affirmative Constructive Speech (2AC)	6 min.
(6) Cross-Examination by the 1NC speaker	3 min.
(7) 2nd Negative Constructive Speech (2NC)	6 min.
(8) Cross-Examination by the 2AC speaker	3 min.
(9) 1st Negative Rebuttal Speech (1NR)	4 min.
(10) 1st Affirmative Rebuttal Speech (1AR)	4 min.
(11) 2nd Negative Rebuttal Speech (2NR)	4 min.
(12) 2nd Affirmative Rebuttal Speech (2AR)	4 min.

Flexible preparation time: 8 minutes for each team. Total time: 68 minutes

- A) Each team member shall give one constructive speech, one rebuttal speech, and conduct one questioning.
- B) All speeches shall be delivered from the podium.
- C) The constructive speaker shall be questioned by one of the speakers from the other side. No one speaker may be the examiner of cross-examination twice in the round.
- D) Debaters not at the podium may not interrupt the speaker during the speech or the cross-examination, except in the case when a partner needs help with translating something into English.
- E) The speaker may not speak over the allotted time, except they may finish their train of thought or argument, within reason.

4. Definition of Terms

The affirmative team has a right to make any reasonable definition of the terms of the proposition. It can also present a case, a specific interpretation of the resolution to defend. The negative team has a right to challenge the affirmative definition and interpretation.

5. The Burden of Proof/Attack

The affirmative team assumes the burden of proof, i.e., to prove that the proposition is probably true. The negative team assumes the burden of attack, i.e., to attack the affirmative team's arguments. The affirmative team must be prepared to give reasonable details of their plan which is a realization of the proposition. It must show that the plan would be desirable if adopted; it does not need to show that the plan would be adopted.

6. A Burden of Proof

A team who presents a claim assumes a burden of proof; otherwise, the judge may ignore it as an assertion. In order to "prove" or establish a claim, a team must support it with enough evidence and reasoning so that it may be considered probably true. Once a claim is established, the judge must believe it until it is refuted by the other team.

In practice, once a claim is made, even if unsupported, it may have some weight, especially if the opposing team says nothing. The judge must write down the claim on the flowsheet and see how it will be developed and/or responded to.

7. Evidence

Evidence includes commonly known facts, other arguments in the debate, statements made in a cross-examination, and citations from published sources. The source of citations must be acknowledged by giving the author's name and qualification, the title of the book (article), and the date of publication. If a direct quotation is used, the original text must carefully be maintained. Ellipses must be indicated as this . . . shows. Words and letters not in the original must be included in square brackets as in [this]. Paraphrases are encouraged but must not be presented as direct quotations. Debaters must not misrepresent what the author says.

8. Constructive Speeches

All the major points of the teams must be presented in the constructive speeches. The affirmative team presents their plan and major reasons why the plan should be adopted, in their very first speech. The negative team presents major attacks on the affirmative team's constructive speeches and disadvantages of the affirmative plan (and/or the counter-plan).

9. Rebuttal Speeches

These speeches must be devoted to refutation and rebuttal of the arguments presented in the constructive speeches. Rebuttal speeches may not present any new constructive (i.e., major) arguments but may present only the extension of the team's constructive arguments. The audience (judges) must ignore such "new arguments." For example, the affirmative team may not present a third advantage of their plan if it only had two advantages in the constructive speeches. The rebuttal speeches also summarize the entire debate for each team's own sake.

10. Refutation & Rebuttal

Refutation is an attack on the opponent's arguments. Refutation is found in all the speeches except for the 1st Affirmative Constructive speech. Rebuttal is a defense of the team's original arguments in light of the opponent's attack. Rebuttal is found in the 2nd Constructive speeches and Rebuttal speeches.

11. Cross-Examination

In the cross-examination, the examiner (one who asks questions) may only ask questions and he/she may not make an argument. The examinee (one who answers questions) must answer any reasonable questions and he/she may not ask questions except for clarification. The examiner may stop the examinee if the answer is irrelevant or unnecessarily long.

The examiner and the examinee directly confront each other, whereas in constructive and rebuttal speeches, the speaker addresses to the audience. For example, an examiner asks, "Did you say XXX?" but a speaker says, "The negative team (or Mr. Tanaka) said XXX."

12. Decision

The decision is given by the judge(s). Their decision may be based on whether the proposition has been shown probably true. For example, if the affirmative team has successfully shown that the advantages of the plan would be bigger than the disadvantages, the affirmative team wins the debate. There's no tie in debate: if the affirmative fails to show that the proposition is probably true, the negative must win the debate.

13. Ballot

Each judge must fill in the ballot and submit it to the tournament director / instructor. The ballot must give the decision (winner), reasons for the decision, and the points of the individual speakers (overall skills and the contents of the speech). The judge is allowed to give a low-point win, i.e., the team with the lower point may win the debated based on the overall arguments.

DEBATE BALLOT (Sample)

Date _____ **Room** _____ **Round** _____ **Evaluator (Judge)** _____

AFF: _____ grand total ____/50 NEG: _____ grand total ____/50

(1) 1st Affirmative Constructive Speech (1AC) _____/10	(2) 2nd Negative Questioning 1AC _____/5
(4) 1st Affirmative Questioning 1NC _____/5	(3) 1st Negative Constructive Speech (1NC) _____/10
(5) 2nd Affirmative Constructive Speech (2AC) _____/10	(6) 1st Negative Questioning 2AC _____/5
(8) 2nd Affirmative Questioning 2NC _____/5	(7) 2nd Negative Constructive Speech (2NC) _____/10
(10) 1st Affirmative Rebuttal Speech (1AR) _____/10	(9) 1st Negative Rebuttal Speech (1NR) _____/10
(12) 2nd Affirmative Rebuttal Speech (2AR) _____/10	(11) 2nd Negative Rebuttal Speech (2NR) _____/10

This debate was won by (AFF / NEG) Team _____.

Reasons for Decision:

