This assignment allows you to develop your argumentative skills in two ways. First you will continue to develop your writing skills and thinking skills by writing a proposition of value paper. Next, you will develop new skills by working with a partner and a group to prepare a debate using your papers as "briefs" or arguments for the debate. In order to complete the debate, you need to be familiar with both the paper requirements and the debate format.

PAPER REQUIREMENTS:
This assignment has similarities to the proposition of fact but is different in at least three significant ways. First, it is longer. This paper should be typed and probably be at least 3-5 pages in length. The paper/brief will become a list of arguments to use in your in-class debate. This additional length also makes room to add a "resitational analysis" (background of the controversy and any needed definitions, clarification of the value and or criteria you will use to support your paper) and add additional claims, grounds, and warrants and backing supporting your claim. It is likely that you will present at minimum of two claims or more in your paper to support your proposition.

Your partner will do her/his own paper/brief creating a minimum of two claims as well that will be turned in separately when all the papers are due. In the end, you and your partner will have a complete “case”-four or more claims to argue between the two of you for your side of the debate. You will be paired with a team of two other students who will also write two papers opposing your point of view and taking an opposite value stance in THEIR papers.

VALUE PROPOSITION:
The second difference is that the proposition itself must be a value proposition. It should develop the value or worth of a particular value object. The value object is the area you are arguing about. (I.e. school prayer, death penalty, euthanasia, etc.) It may be necessary to provide a brief background to the controversy prior to the statement of the proposition itself. Keep the proposition relatively short. (Again, return to the proposed value propositions you created as a possible place to begin). Additionally, there are two websites in the "interesting links" section of this website that will offer you an extensive list of topic areas. They are listed as SpeakOut.com issues and Deatabase.com. Both of these sites offer a very wide variety of possible topic areas. In your paper, you must also indicate a specific value that you will support. The attached handout on values both defines and provides examples of value areas. Values, as we have discussed in class, include things like, life, freedom, safety, family security, etc. The value may or may not be specifically stated in the proposition. It will also be necessary to define key terms in your value object prior to the establishment of your argument. The value should be stated in your resitational analysis as part of the argument after the proposition. You may or may not need or want to provide backing for the value itself. The value may also play a role in the warrants you provide in later arguments.

Organizational pattern: The simplest way to organize this argument is to use a proposition-to-proof format. Both sides of the debate can easily utilize this format. This is actually easier than
you might think. Once you decide on a topic area and phrase it in such a way that both sides can live with it, do your basic research. After reviewing your research, the group might want to refine the proposition to make it clearly reflect the inferences you believe are supported in your evidence. Here is an example:

Government: Needle exchange programs are beneficial to society. This proposition can be supported by the value of either health or safety.

Opposition: Needle exchange programs are detrimental to society. This will be supported by the value of societal safety.

Next, each partner should decide on best reasons your proposition is valid. Each of you will choose a minimum of two developed claims. Just look at the proposition and insert the word “because” and look for what you will argue. You should probably come up with some claims and grounds that are supported by your backing.

For instance, in this example, the Government might assert the following two claims:
Needle exchange programs are beneficial to society. (BECAUSE THEY LESSEN THE SPREAD OF AIDS).
Needle exchange programs are beneficial to society. (BECAUSE THEY LEAD ADDICTS INTO TREATMENT)."

The Opposition might want to argue:
Needle exchange programs are detrimental to society.” (BECAUSE THEY ENDORSE DRUG USE”)
Needle exchange programs are detrimental to society.” (BECAUSE ADDICTS ARE NOT PUNISHED”).

You may or may not want to change these claims later but it is probably the easiest way to initially find the reasons you will support. From there, you will want to decide what the claims are specifically grounded in (indications that support exists) what the warrants are (specifics the reasoning process used) and what backing (specific evidence you will use to support the grounds, warrant and claim) you will provide.

NOTE: These elements will be formatted and identified in the same manner as the Proposition of Fact paper/brief.

(EXAMPLE)
RESOLUTIONAL ANALYSIS
Background of controversy: Although controversial, many needle exchange programs have been used for nearly twenty years in an effort to reduce blood borne disease among injectable drug users. While those in opposition to needle sharing programs claim that drug use will increase and public safety will be diminished others feel these programs are a viable way to protect public health. Extensive scientific study has been done to ascertain the societal benefits of these programs. The results of these studies validate the following proposition:
Proposition of Value: Needle exchange programs are beneficial to society

Definition: Our definition is provided by The Center for Aids Prevention Studies in the Article, "Does Needle Exchange Work?" Site last updated 12/98, "Needle exchange programs (NEPs) distribute clean needles and safely dispose of used ones for injection drug users, and also generally offer a variety of related services, including referrals to drug treatment and HIV counseling and testing.

Value object: Needle exchange programs

Value: Societal health

Claim A: Diminished societal health from drugs indicates a need for needle exchange programs.

Grounds A1: Data on drug use establishes the need. The HIV/Aids Information Center provided current information in the article “Does Needle Exchange Work?” reprinted from the Center for Aids Prevention Studies at the University of California, San Francisco last updated December 1998: "More than one million people in the Us inject drugs frequently, at a cost to society in health care, lost productivity, accidents, and crime of more than $50 billion per year. People who inject drugs imperil their own health. If they contract HIV or hepatitis, their needle-sharing partners, sexual partners, and offspring may become infected. It is estimated that half of all new HIV infections in the US are occurring among injection drug users. For women 61% of all aids cases are due to injection drug use or sex with partners who inject drugs. Injection drug use is the source of infection for more than half of all children born with HIV. Injection drug use is also the most common risk factor in people with hepatitis C infection. Up to 90% of IUD’s are estimated to be infected with hepatitis C which is easily transmitted and can cause chronic liver disease."

Grounds A2: A further link to diminished societal health is supported by the World Disease Weekly Plus, on April 26, 1999: "Tuberculosis is an important health issue among drug users."

Grounds A3: The need for NEP’s is clearly summarized by Charles W. Henderson staff-writer in the Aids Weekly on November 15, 1999: "Because access to sterile syringes is limited, transmission of blood-borne infections to injection drug-users, their partners, and their children continue to be an enormous public health concern."

Warrant A1: A strong correlation exists between intravenous drug use and societal ill-health (causation/generalization)

Claim B: Needle exchange program are beneficial to society because they lessen the spread of aids.

Grounds B1: The reported benefits outweigh potential harms. The previous cited article, “Does needle exchange work?” provides backing; "A study of 81 cities around the world compared HIV infection rates among IDU’s with cities that did have NEP’s with cities that did not have NEP’s. In the 52 cities without NEP’s, HIV infections increased by 5.9% per year on average. In the 29 cities with NEPs, HIV infection rates decreased by 5.8% per year."

Grounds B2: On April 20, 1998, the Department of Health and Human Services Secretary announced the following in a press release: "A meticulous scientific review has now proven that needle exchange programs can reduce the transmission of HIV and save lives without losing ground in the battle against illegal drugs. It offers communities that decide to pursue needle exchange programs yet another weapon in their fight against aids."
**Warrant B1:** These studies reflect causation and are widely reported.

(Generalization/sign/causeation)

**Conclusion:**
While controversy still exists. It seems apparent from the argument provided that societal health may be better preserved with Needle Exchange programs than without.

**Sources cited: Use MLA format**

**DEBATE FORMAT:**
There will be two members on each team. The team supporting the proposition will be called "the Government." The team on the other side will be called "the Opposition." Each team member will present at least one speech. See me to determine which side will speak first.

Order of speaker:
PRIME MINISTER (6 minutes) - provides Resolutational analysis and outlines the government's arguments in favor of proposition.
LEADER OF OPPOSITION (6 minutes) – Provides opposition's differences in resolutational analysis and outlines opposition responses to government arguments, provides outline of opposition's arguments.
MEMBER OF GOVERNMENT (6 minutes) responds to oppositions Resolutational analysis arguments + will provide additional backing for government arguments and responds to opposition arguments.
MEMBER OF OPPOSITION (6 minutes) resolutational analysis, responds to government arguments, provides backing for opposition arguments.
LEADER OF OPPOSITION REBUTTAL (3 minutes) Summarizes weakness in key government positions summarizes strength of key opposition positions.
PRIME MINISTER REBUTTAL: (minutes) summarizes key issues in the debate from the government perspective.
(Arguments won by government, lost by opposition)
MEMBER OF OPPOSITION: (3 minutes) summarizes key issues in the debate from the opposition perspective.
(Arguments won by opposition, lost by government)
MEMBER OF GOVERNMENT: (3 minutes) summarizes key issues in the debate.

The keys to an effective debate are the following: Working with your partner and your opponents. It is critical that you communicate. Get phone numbers and e-mail addresses immediately. Stay in touch. If possible, research together or share research. The more familiar you are with each other's arguments, the better your debate will be. If possible, have a practice debate to have a good understanding of basic refutation technique. Be sure to do the homework assignment on refutation. Keep it simple: each side should have no more than two major arguments, using a flow sheet during the debate. "Pre-flow" the debate with the arguments of both sides so you can speak from your flow sheet. Trying to speak from your paper is difficult unless you are the first speaker in the debate.