

I will address both the Affirmative and Negative values and criteria at the same time.

My value of \_\_\_\_\_ is superior in this round because:

- my opponent's value is irrelevant to the resolution.
- the effects of my value are more beneficial than the effects of my opponent's value
- my value has more intrinsic worth than my opponent's value
- when you put the two values in conflict, you would choose my value as paramount
- my value encompasses my opponent's value-the opposing value is only part of mine
- my value is of a higher lexical priority than my opponent's value
- the purpose behind my value is superior to my opponent's value's purpose
- philosophers agree to the higher importance of my value over my opponent's value
- in using the criterion of \_\_\_\_\_ to weigh our values, mine proves best for this resolution.

Consider what (person →) \_\_\_\_\_ said about (value →) \_\_\_\_\_,  
 " \_\_\_\_\_"  
 \_\_\_\_\_

My criterion of \_\_\_\_\_ is superior in this round because:

- my opponent's criterion seems irrelevant to the resolution and values at hand.
- the effects of my criterion are more beneficial than the effects of my opponent's
- my criterion has more intrinsic worth than my opponent's criterion
- my criterion encompasses my opponent's criterion as a measuring tool for this debate
- the purpose behind my criterion is superior to my opponent's criterion's purpose
- philosophers agree to the higher importance of my criterion over my opponent's

Now let's take a look at the definitions and observations offered.

I believe we should accept my definition of \_\_\_\_\_ over my opponent's definition because:

- all of my definitions come from the same source, I did not strategically choose them
- my opponent provided a biased source for this term.
- my source was a philosopher who gave great thought to the usage of this term.

We must not simply accept my opponent's observation(s) - make sure you consider:

- the nature and wording of the observation was abusive to the debate round
- the observation simply restates the resolution and gives us no insight
- the observation is entirely false and should in no way impact the round

My observation of: \_\_\_\_\_

still stands because my opponent:

- failed to truly attack the truth of this observation.
- dropped my observation, thus accepting it as a given fact in this round.
- agreed with my observation.
- showed through other reasoning and arguments that my observation holds true.
- Also, my observation is fair to both sides in the debate.

Now I will specifically address my contentions.

**My Contention 1:** \_\_\_\_\_ : stands strong because:

\_\_\_ my opponent dropped my arguments and made no direct attacks against it.

\_\_\_ my support provides for the paramount value of \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ multiple philosophers support my arguments: \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ my support is both philosophical and pragmatic - recall my specific scenarios of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ the attacks my opponent made are: \_\_\_ false, \_\_\_ simply surface-level, \_\_\_ not as strong as my original points, \_\_\_ overcome when I point out \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ in attacking this contention, my opponent failed to consider \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ I concretely linked my points together with the value, criterion, and my side of the resolution

\_\_\_ this contention inherently attacks my opponent's stance because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**In the interest of time, I will move on to my Contention 2:** \_\_\_\_\_ : which still holds true because:

\_\_\_ my opponent dropped my arguments and made no direct attacks against it.

\_\_\_ my support provides for the paramount value of \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ multiple philosophers support my arguments: \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ my support is both philosophical and pragmatic - recall my specific scenarios of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ the attacks my opponent made are: \_\_\_ false, \_\_\_ simply surface-level, \_\_\_ not as strong as my original points, \_\_\_ overcome when I point out \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ in attacking this contention, my opponent failed to consider \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ I concretely linked my points together with the value, criterion, and my side of the resolution

\_\_\_ this contention inherently attacks my opponent's stance because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**My Contention 3:** \_\_\_\_\_ : remains because:

\_\_\_ my opponent dropped my arguments and made no direct attacks against it.

\_\_\_ my support provides for the paramount value of \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ multiple philosophers support my arguments: \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ my support is both philosophical and pragmatic - recall my specific scenarios of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ the attacks my opponent made are: \_\_\_ false, \_\_\_ simply surface-level, \_\_\_ not as strong as my original points, \_\_\_ overcome when I point out \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ in attacking this contention, my opponent failed to consider \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ I concretely linked my points together with the value, criterion, and my side of the resolution

\_\_\_ this contention inherently attacks my opponent's stance because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Now I will address my opponent's contentions.

In addressing **Contention 1** - group together all of the arguments in this contention - you will see that this contention falls because:

- \_\_\_ my opponent only provided [#] \_\_\_ pieces of support
- \_\_\_ the provided support actually contradicts the contention tag/value offered because \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ the support from [source] \_\_\_\_\_ is biased/controversial/less trustworthy and we should not automatically accept this as evidence.
- \_\_\_ the philosopher my opponent uses actually contradicts this contention in his work/quote: \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ the points made have no direct impact on this resolution - we're supposed to be weighing whether or not \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ my opponent failed to connect the information given with the resolution/value/criteria
- \_\_\_ my opponent lacked warrants and impacts for this contention
- \_\_\_ in regards to the evidence basically saying \_\_\_\_\_, apply my arguments and evidence of \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ when analyzing this contention, you need to consider the special condition of \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ the main point of this contention does not support my opponent's side of the resolution
- \_\_\_ in response to my opponent saying \_\_\_\_\_, I offer the following block of evidence: [pull out prepared counter-evidence and read] \_\_\_\_\_

I also have several attacked against **my opponent's contention 2** - group together all of the arguments in this contention:

- \_\_\_ my opponent only provided [#] \_\_\_ pieces of support
- \_\_\_ the provided support actually contradicts the contention tag/value offered because \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ the support from [source] \_\_\_\_\_ is biased/controversial/less trustworthy and we should not automatically accept this as evidence.
- \_\_\_ the philosopher my opponent uses actually contradicts this contention in his work/quote: \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ the points made have no direct impact on this resolution - we're supposed to be weighing whether or not \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ my opponent failed to connect the information given with the resolution/value/criteria
- \_\_\_ my opponent lacked warrants and impacts for this contention
- \_\_\_ in regards to the evidence basically saying \_\_\_\_\_, apply my arguments and evidence of \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ when analyzing this contention, you need to consider the special condition of \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ the main point of this contention does not support my opponent's side of the resolution
- \_\_\_ in response to my opponent saying \_\_\_\_\_, I offer the following block of evidence: [pull out prepared counter-evidence and read] \_\_\_\_\_

We must also look to the weaknesses of my opponent's third Contention - group together all of the arguments in this contention - you will see that this contention falls because:

\_\_\_ my opponent only provided [#] \_\_\_ pieces of support  
\_\_\_ the provided support actually contradicts the contention tag/value offered because

\_\_\_ the support from [source] \_\_\_\_\_ is biased/controversial/less trustworthy and we should not automatically accept this as evidence.

\_\_\_ the philosopher my opponent uses actually contradicts this contention in his work/quote:

\_\_\_ the points made have no direct impact on this resolution - we're supposed to be weighing whether or not \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ my opponent failed to connect the information given with the resolution/value/criteria

\_\_\_ my opponent lacked warrants and impacts for this contention

\_\_\_ in regards to the evidence basically saying \_\_\_\_\_, apply my arguments and evidence of \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ when analyzing this contention, you need to consider the special condition of \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ the main point of this contention does not support my opponent's side of the resolution in response to my opponent saying \_\_\_\_\_, I offer the following block of evidence: [pull out prepared counter-evidence and read] \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

As I close this speech, let me crystallize the main reason my side wins this round:

- (1) I provide for, and best uphold, the paramount value for this resolution.
- (2) My criterion is both unbiased, and the most beneficial, in weighing the round
- (3) My contentions stand while my opponent's have been defeated; AND
- (4) I provide the most, and the strongest, philosophical and pragmatic support.
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_

For these reasons, I must urge for an [affirmative/negative] \_\_\_\_\_ ballot.