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CHAPTER ONE
PRESENT STATUS OF ACADEMIC DEBATE

The pool of literature on academic debate is relatively shallow. Certainly there are a number of articles concerning academic debate which have been published in the relevant journals, but few of them go into any considerable depth. Certainly there are a number of textbooks which have been written about academic debate, but these are often merely "how to" manuals which give less than considerable focus to theoretical issues. Certainly there are several good collections of articles about academic debate, but often they only serve to highlight the fragmentation of debate theory instead of trying to bring it together into a sensible whole. This paucity of theoretical work is surprising when you consider the number of faculty involved in academic debate at the high school as well as the college and university level. One would think that they might have written more lengthy pieces than is the case. There seems to be a specific paucity of detailed writing on academic debate theory.

The purpose of this work is to attempt to begin filling this void by building a comprehensive theory of academic debate. This purpose will be addressed through the consideration of four major concerns.

First, this study will attempt to identify and evaluate the shortcomings of the theoretical models (commonly referred to as paradigms) currently utilized in academic debate theory. A number of
differing paradigms exist for academic debate theory. These will be examined in terms of their major precepts, their use in debate situations, and the emerging criticisms of each as a paradigm. As well, a number of indictments will be made against the current set of paradigms as a group.

Second, an attempt is made to identify and evaluate the characteristics of gaming as a human communication activity. Communication takes place in number of different ways. Gaming is one of these. It is explained that gaming is a very complex and interactive communication mode. It has a number of different benefits for those utilizing it, which are outlined.

Third, an attempt is made to propose a theoretical model for academic debate based on gaming. Duke has established a number of criteria, steps and components found in a game. Specifically, Duke’s guidelines are utilized to move through a game design process, to specify components of the game and to identify techniques used in the game. This theoretical structure is utilized to roll out a “game of debate.”

Fourth, an attempt is made to relate this theoretical model to the problems and promises of academic debate. Gaming is demonstrated as a
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viable paradigm for academic debate, as it avoids the indictments generated against the other paradigms while providing a method for their integration. Gaming is also seen as a possible framework for answering those who are critical of the conduct of academic debate. In some instances these criticisms can be refuted by a game perspective, while in other areas gaming provides a meaningful way of exploring for possible solutions to problems found in academic debate. As well, an attempt is made to detail the specific benefits which should flow from a gaming perspective for academic debate, namely to improve the educational value of academic debate and to spur additional and hopefully productive theoretical work.

The purpose of this work, more specifically, is to integrate existing paradigms into an overarching paradigm based on gaming. The contention will be that academic debate is rapidly moving towards being a game already, and debate theory needs to keep up with this evolution. The “new” debate is almost in place already and debate theory needs to begin to follow suit.

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. SCOPE AND FORMAT

Interscholastic and intercollegiate academic debate in the United State is an activity of considerable size. Large numbers of students compete as representations of broad spectrum of high schools, college
and university, as is discussed in a later section.

Academic debate is a competitive activity. By "competitive" I mean that it involves winners and losers in a formal sense. At the conclusion of each "debate" one side is designated the winner and the other the loser. Participants are also assigned a quality rating of (usually) from one to thirty points, with thirty being best.

The competition format is best understood by explaining the tournament format. Freeley writes that a tournament provides opportunities for debate by bringing together a number of teams from different schools, while at the tournament each team will debate several times. A tournament is divided into rounds, which are a group of debates taking place simultaneously. The standard college tournament provides for eight preliminary rounds followed by elimination rounds at an octafinal (top sixteen) or a quarterfinal (top eight) level, as is done in professional tennis. This is, however, not the only tournament format and the number of preliminary and elimination rounds may be any number specified, including zero. Tournaments may last one day or, as with the American Forensic Association's National Debate Tournament, five days.

There are a large number of tournaments both at the high school and
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the college and university level. For example, at the college and university level Howe has estimated that over 1,100 colleges have reasonably active debate programs and that they attend over 400 college and university debate tournaments each year.

While detested by some, as we shall see later, many see debate tournaments as outstanding educational instruments. As Freeley has observed,

The carefully planned debate tournament, designed to achieve the highest educational standards and operated to provide maximum efficiency under the administration of an educator well trained in argumentation is one of the greatest educational debate techniques.

Clearly, a large number of students and faculty are involved in a curricular and co-curricular activity of considerable magnitude. At some point in their lives millions of Americans have been touched by academic debate—intellectually, spiritually and perhaps even physically.

2. PLACEMENT WITHIN ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS

Academic debate in America is a creature of educational institutions. No other organizing framework for academic debate exists

---


4 Freeley, p.291.
outside of educational institutions. As Joseph Perkins noted, "t college and university debate, it "obviously could not take place without colleges; it is a part of the whole and not the whole itself. One must keep in mind that debate programs are dependent on these institutions and not vice versa."

B. ACADEMIC DEBATE THEORY

This work deals almost entirely with the issue of academic debate theory. Within this area, the main concerns are as follows: what are we doing in academic debate, why are we doing it, and how can it be improved? In order to answer these questions it is necessary to briefly review the history of debate theory.

1. EARLY YEARS OF DEVELOPMENT

Academic debate began very much as a reflection of debate in the society in general. As Brockriede has written, what happened in debates on college and university campuses in the first twenty-five years of the 20th Century was "not very far removed from what happened in the law courts or legislative halls of the country." He notes that it is no
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wonder that so many debaters moved easily into these fields.

The major change came when the focus of debating switched from public debates to the tournament format. Brockridge reports that the economic conditions brought about by the Great Depression caused debate programs to look for low-cost alternatives for gaining considerable student experience in debating. The result was the debate tournament. Brockridge identified the end result of this process — now the tournament is a "coast to coast" phenomenon.

2. INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF DEBATE THEORY

The creation of the tournament and its ultimate take over of academic debate has broad implications for the process of debate.

First, the public aspects of earlier debates were lost. Whereas audiences were advertised for and encouraged in the years before the advent of the tournament, after the advent of the tournament there were hardly enough spectators or auditoriums to be distributed among the number of debates taking place at the same time. Academic debate no longer was an extension of the real world examples of debate, but had become a new form of debate. The audience had changed, it no longer was a group of citizens, but now a specific judge.
The second important impact of the tournament format was the use of the "expert" judge. Previously, audiences or members of the community might be asked to judge a debate. Now, however, with the audiences gone and the need to supply a large number of judges during any given round, judges were found among the debate community itself, such as faculty, coaches, or previous debaters. The "common person" was no longer likely to judge; s/he was replaced by the "debate expert." Thus, theories of debate which had been coextensive with theories operative in the outside forums of debate were replaced by more specialized bodies of knowledge.

3. EMERGENCE OF A SPECIALIZED BODY OF THEORY

Once the tool of the tournament had been shaped by the debaters and coaches, it began to influence the shape of its creators. In the view Harris and Smith, "Debate once shaped a tool to help satisfy the ideal goals of debate. The tool has been shaping debate almost ever since."

With the outside model shattered, debaters and educators in the field of debate struggled to develop theories and worldviews which adequately fit into the expanse of their activities. If debate wasn't merely a copy of what takes place outside of the debate round, what is it? Without old models to copy, new models had to be found.

---

4. THE QUESTION OF PARADIGM EMERGES

One of the major mechanisms utilized to give guidance to academic debate has been the "paradigm." The concept of the paradigm will be explained briefly and then related to its uses within the debate round.

a. PARADIGM AS CONCEPT

Much of the popularity of the term "paradigm" must be credited to Thomas Kuhn's work, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Within this work Kuhn describes paradigms as concepts used in two different senses: first, a concept to stand for the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques and so on shared by the members of a given community; and second, it may denote one element in this constellation which operates as a guide to "puzzle solutions" and decision making. As Phillips has noted, it is probably paradigms in the second sense which are used most often in academic debate.

For my own part, I think of a paradigm as a "Weltanschaung," or "world view" of a given individual. A "model of models," a paradigm organizes our behaviors and decisions within academic debate by giving


10 Neil Phillips, "Theory into Practice: The Argumentation Laboratory" (Privately Published, Lawrence, Kansas, January, 1980) p.2.
us metaphorical and hierarchical guidance.

When considering human conflict situations, such as debates and games, the world image of those involved is extremely important. In describing a debate situation, Rapoport has noted that a person's "world view" can influence the treatment of the subject matter. "...[without raising a single fact, entirely contradictory descriptions can and are given of persons, situations, social orders, etc., by selecting (often unconsciously) only the features which support preconceived notions." This world image an operate at the conscious level as well, so that individuals will retain this world image even in difficult situations. As Rapoport continues, "To put it crudely and very figuratively, a man holds on to his world image not only because it takes effort to change it, but also because he needs his particular image or else because he is afraid to look at other images." The importance, therefore, of paradigmatic "world images" needs to be stressed.

while Maysterman has discovered at least twenty-two different uses

11
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Rapoport, p. 255.
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of the word "paradigm" within Kunn's work, some seem more relevant than others to academic debate. Specifically, paradigms can be thought of as "exemplars" or concrete "problem-solutions that students encounter" in their education. These exemplars operate as guides for decision making and problem solving. In an academic debate a "paradigm" serves to provide a metaphor, world view, and a practical guide for decision making.

b. HOW DEBATERS USE PARADIGMS

Paradigms have become increasingly important to debaters. The discussion of paradigms has become more and more prominent in the debates of the past few years. As Rowland has observed,

Conflict among debate paradigms is playing an increasingly important role in debate. Debaters argue about the utility of paradigms and oftentimes judges accept or reject arguments based on the presuppositions of their judging model. The use of paradigms as evaluative standards, in turn, encourages debaters to adapt their arguments to the models which their judges use. In this context it is clearly important that the values of the various paradigms be considered.

While often understood as a concept, little understanding has been
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14 Kunn, p.187.

directed at how paradigms are used within a given debate. Based on observations or when debaters call paradigms into use, what follows are some of the uses for paradigms.

1. GIVE STRUCTURE TO ARGUMENTS

Debaters will utilize a specific paradigm in order to give some structure or organization to their presentations. For example, a "stock issues" paradigm would be used by a negative team to indicate how their positions are organized around various stock issues. Also, an affirmative team might suggest policy making in an attempt to organize the negative team's arguments into the defense of a "policy system." Paradigms can serve as a "model of models," a hierarchy of concepts which can then be used to organize the positions of a team in a debate.

2. FOR STRATEGIC ADVANTAGE

Debate is a competitive activity, thus debaters will strategically utilize paradigms as they see fit to help them win. For example, if an affirmative team wishes to limit the options of a negative team, they might call for a policy making paradigm in order to hold the negative team to one system only. Conversely, if the negative team wished to advocate a number of different systems in response to an affirmative team's positions, they might call for the paradigm of hypothesis testing. Another example would be a negative team who has only one issue in a debate and then argues for the use of the stock issues paradigm and
that since this is one of the "stock issues" they should be awarded the
decision on the basis of this one issue. As paradigms provide models for
the debate, it is not surprising that debaters manipulate them for their
own advantage.

3. AIDING THE JUDGE WITH A DECISION RULE

While this has something in common with the second use for
paradigms, this practice involves direct suggestion to the judge as to
how the decision should be made. Paradigms, in their function as guides
and exemplars for decision making, can be readily applied to this task.
For example, debaters might ask the judge to become a "policy maker" and
present reasons why a "policy maker" would vote for them, while opposing
debaters might advocate that the judge engage in hypothesis testing
which would result in a vote for them.

C. CURRENT ACADEMIC DEBATE PARADIGMS

Any attempt to analyze existing paradigms in academic debate faces
a considerable barrier. Stated simply, the literature on paradigms
usually runs significantly behind the use of paradigms within the actual
practice of debate. Those involved in debate are often too busy "doing"
debate to spend a considerable amount of time "writing about" it. As

Robert Gass has written,

Robert Gass, The Stock Issues Perspective: A Reappraisal (Privately
Academic debate appears to be one of those human endeavors in which formal theorizing about the activity never seems to catch up to the actual state of the art. Like the dutiful Arab wife who follows her husband at a distance of twenty or thirty paces, debate literature seems to lag behind practice by a good two or three years.

As an active debate coach and writer about debate, I believe this empowers me to expand upon the literature in the following sections to also include concepts which are emerging from the argumentative battlefields or the debate rounds themselves.

Before evaluating the particular paradigms, it is worthwhile to establish their existence and popularity. Cox examined the judging philosophies of those serving as judges at the National Debate Tournament. In a question designed to discover which paradigms judges identified themselves with, the following results were obtained: choice of policy system (policy making) 42.9%; evaluator of issues (stock issues) 32.1%; evaluator of argument skills (critic of argument) 15.5%; critic of rhetorical proposition (hypothesis testing) 3.6%; and tabia rasa 5.9%. In a study at the National Debate Tournament in 1977, Thomas found that almost 75% of the judges attending the National Debate Tournament associated with policy making, hypothesis testing, or
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stock issues. Most of the remaining 25% utilized whatever paradigm was agreed on by the debaters.

Each of these paradigms will be examined with an aim towards determining what the basic tenets of the paradigm are, how it is used within the debate and some unique criticisms of it.

Before dealing with the paradigms suggested in Cox's study, some attention should be given to the traditional debate paradigm.

One finds the elements of a "debate" in many parts of American society. Rapoport has noted that in matters pertaining to debate, America has "fancy-sounding "forensics,"" as well as simple salesmanship. He notes that there is often a great deal of criticism, which is often an analysis of debated issues. Beyond this, Rapoport notes the "arbitration boards and courts, bodies set up to mediate debates." Thus, the elements of debate can be found throughout the society. It is from this societal context or debate that the "traditional" debate paradigm emerges.

a. A PLACE TO PRACTICE THE SKILLS OF DEBATE

As we have seen, academic debate was traditionally an extension of
debate activities taking place within society in general. In evaluating a traditional paradigm, Sanders has written that a judge needs to examine an entire bundle of skills which debaters might exhibit. He sees this as an interaction between and among factors relating to logic and persuasion. He identifies a number of core concepts which need to be evaluated and related to argument alone, such as analysis, investigation, evidence, reasoning, rebuttal and rebuttal. Thus, the judge with the traditional paradigm evaluates the debaters on the basis of group of skills valued by society. Most of these skills are explained in terms of the "goals" of debate in general, which are identified with the goals of society within the traditional paradigm.

b. Debate Responds to the Needs of Society

Freeley has established a list of fifteen "goals of debate," and within them can clearly be seen the basis for the traditional paradigm - the transfer of skills which society finds admirable. Briefly, and only to serve my point of demonstrating how the traditional paradigm strictly adheres to the supposed needs of society, the goals spelled out by Freeley include: (1) preparation for participation in a free society; (2) imparting leadership skills; (3) developing skill in argument; (4)
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21 Freeley, pp.18-25.
increasing knowledge of current events; (5) expanding powers of critical thinking; (6) helping integrate knowledge; (7) increasing inquiry; (8) exposure to quality instruction; (9) increasing student scholarship; (10) training in the ability to respond promptly; (11) increasing critical listening; (12) increasing good judgement; (13) increasing courage; (14) improving delivery and composition of speeches; and (15) developing social maturity.

There is little doubt that the list compiled by Freeley is both comprehensive and a rather tall order for academic debate to fill. Doubtless these goals could be applied to almost any educational activity within out society and provide a good match on most of the goals. The nature of this list seems to underscore the contention that within the traditional debate paradigm, the activity is seen as training students in specific skills which are involved in the debate process.

c. SOUN D PAR ADIGMATIC STRUCTURE

There is little doubt that this is an appealing paradigm for what was traditional, not-tournament debate. This paradigm is very much like the cartoon character Popeye, who is constantly saying, "I am what I am, n dats all what I am." Traditional debate was a copy of debate in society and as such its paradigm of "teaching debate skill" is a very appealing one.

The problem, as we have seen, is that academic debate within the
tournament format is no longer a copy of debate within society, but a different and unique entity. The result is that various specialized paradigms have been developed. These are explored now.

1. Policy Making

Cox could report that judges identifying themselves with policy making were predominant. They viewed the debate process "essentially as a comparison of alternate policy systems" and the judge as one who makes a policy decision. The debate resolution, phrased as a proposition of policy, is operationally defined as a "system," e.g., the specific elements of the affirmative team's plan. Most judges also reit that the alternative system of the negative team should also be spelled out. Then the judge would weigh "the merits of the policy system the affirmative team offers against the merits of the present system the negative team is defending." Within policy making the negative system may also be a non-resolutional structural change to amend the present system.

a. Basic Tenets of Policy Making

1. Assumption of a Role

22 Cox, p. 52.

23 Ibid.
within this paradigm the judge is said to be a "policy maker," perhaps a legislator, executive officer, or a judicial authority. The debate teams are often seen as advocates for different government policies. The job of the judge is to choose between the two offered and this is the factor in deciding who did the better job of debating. Cox could quote one judge as saying that the comparison of "policy systems is the standard by which a team ought to demonstrate it did a better job of debating." 24

This role has been embraced enthusiastically. Judges, in some instances, now actively assume that they are government officials actually deciding policy.

2. COMPETING SYSTEMS

In order for the debate to exist within the policy making paradigm, there must be grounds for making a CHOICE between the two systems. In evaluating the judging statements of policy makers, Cox found that the notion of a comparison of policies implies that the systems offered are competing. "One judge suggested that the policy systems "must in some sense be substitutes or one another; not the proverbial two ships passing in the night." Thus, an affirmative team's proposal needs to

24 Cox, p. 64.

25 Cox, p. 62.
show that it is a reasonable substitute for the negative team's present system. As well, the negative team would have to demonstrate that their counterplan was a reasonable substitute for the affirmative team's plan.

3. SYSTEMIC PERSPECTIVE

Policy making stresses the choice between two "systems." Each team presents a system and then defends it. In a system, there are a number of elements which are interacting. Lichtman explains it this way,

Policy systems are complex, multifaceted entities consisting of ends or goals, means designed to achieve those ends and checks and balances designed to maintain optimal relationships between means and ends (e.g., to insure that emphasis on one means will not contradict other means to the detriment of the system). All elements in a policy system interact with each other, so that the system forms an organized whole that is not merely the sum of its individual parts.

One of the ways in which the elements of a system interact is through probabilities. Cox reported that policy making judges utilized probabilities. "The Bayesian notion of interaction between the desirability of a commodity or state of affairs and the probability of obtaining it" is reflected in the decisions. As one policy making judge explained, at the end of the debate, "I calculate the significance of advantages, considering the probability of inherency which remains."

26 Phillips, p.7.
27 Cox, p.63.
Lichtman explains this process by advising, "To determine the level of net benefits achieved by a policy system when multiple outcomes are considered, policy makers simply sum for all anticipated results the products of their probabilities and values." Through this mechanism, system influences are examined.

4. DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION

By placing the students in the role of a member of our representative government, the student is, in policy making, trained to take part in this role in the future. While policy making is an attempt to further elaborate on academic debate as a unique field, it certainly has not neglected certain areas which were of concern to the traditional paradigm, such as participation in government.

D. USE IN DEBATE SITUATIONS

1. FORCING THE NEGATIVE TEAM TO TAKE A POSITION

One element involved in the traditional paradigm is a negative position that involves merely rejecting affirmative team's arguments without building a discrete position for the negative team. Policy making calls for the negative team to discard this role or sneer

rejection and declares that both teams must have a defensible policy. This can be particularly helpful to affirmative teams in that often negative teams are reacting to a case for the first time and therefore do not have a well-thought-out policy when they stand up to speak. This process can also be helpful for the negative team in that they can stipulate their precise position for comparison, instead of being forced by the affirmative team to answer for the shortcomings of a different and perhaps inferior system.

2. BALANCING AND INTERACTION OF ISSUES

The policy making paradigm can be helpful in allowing debaters to express the outcome of a balancing of the issues. For example, a debater might indicate that while both systems in a debate provided some of quality X, a factor in their system provided MORE of the quality X and therefore was a superior system in the balance.

Policy making can also provide a useful method for expressing the interaction of elements in the debate. For example, an affirmative team might concede that a given negative team's argument canceled out a considerable portion of their advantage, but not ALL of it, and they thus could contend that there was still some reason to award them the decision. As well, by indicating an interplay of probabilities and outcomes, probability factors can be inserted between various outcomes so that the interaction of factors is more readily understood.
3. PROPOSALS AS GOVERNMENT EDICTS

Within policy making, the proposals of the teams are considered to be government edicts. Often they act as legislative enactments, but they may also be characterized as executive regulations or as case law handed down by the judicial system. Thus, teams argue that their proposals have the "force of law" and exist as creatures of government. The specific affirmative plan, for example, is considered within a policy making debate to be the model for a piece of legislation in many cases.

4. GUIDANCE FOR DEFINITIONS

Since the debate is defined as an exercise in policy making, whenever questions arise as to definitions (whether they be definitions of words within the resolution or within the arguments themselves) they are looked at within a "policy" context. For example, teams might argue that because their definitions are "legal definitions," and thus within the field of policy making, they are superior to the definitions out of a "dictionary" offered by the opposition. Another example is the use of a "legislative history" by some teams, so that the content of their speeches are considered a legislative history of their proposal for the purpose of defining the precise terms within their plan.

2. HYPOTHESIS TESTING

As policy making models itself after the world of the political,
hypothesis testing models itself after the world of the scientific. Trusting in the penetrating abilities of scientific thought, a scientific model is applied to the debate process.

a. Basic Tenets of Hypothesis Testing

In Cox's description of the judging philosophies, a surprisingly small number (3.6%) represented this paradigm. Certainly this theoretical perspective is heard from far more often than that in debate rounds, and it certainly has had a considerable impact on the development of thought within the debate community.

Cox quotes from one judge (either Bill Henderson or someone quoting him verbatim) a definition of hypothesis testing as a paradigm.

The role of the judge is that of the intelligent citizen trying to determine the probable truth of the proposition. He regards the proposition as a hypothesis and the debate as a means for testing it.

The proposition is not considered in comparison to another proposition, but it is seen as a statement which can be proven or disproven on its own merits. One wonders at the wording of a statement from Henderson.
which sounds surprisingly similar.

This paper defends the statement: the role of the judge is that of the intelligent citizen trying to determine the probable truth of the proposition. He regards the proposition as a hypothesis and the debate as a means of testing it.

Henderson concludes,

...that the role perception most appropriate to intercollegiate judging is that of an intelligent citizen who tries to determine the most probable truth of a single proposition. The judge sees the proposition as a hypothesis from the world of political science.

1. SCIENTIFIC SEARCH FOR TRUTH

Just as the scientist would try to determine the truth of a research hypothesis, so the judge in a debate observes what takes place and then votes for or against the resolution based on its probable truth. Henderson defends the notion that the judge can, in a political and social activity, take on the role of the scientist. He fondly quotes Kunn himself as saying that, "This genetic aspect of the parallel between political and scientific development should no longer be open to
doubt." Actually, quoting this statement from Kuhn does not necessarily prove that the scientific process is applicable to political matters. In the section from Kuhn which Henderson quotes, he is speaking of the similarities between revolutions in scientific thought and revolutions in political structures, rather than the act of decision making. Specifically, he refers to the discovery of X-rays as a "Balkan Revolution" in its impact on the study of radiation and cathode ray tubes. Although not specifically supported by Kuhn in this regard, Henderson continues by saying, "To parallel the scientists' use of the null hypothesis in experiments to the judge who decides between two debate teams is acceptable."

2. RESOLUTION AS HYPOTHESIS

Specifically, the resolution open for debate is, as we have seen, phrased as a research hypothesis. Perhaps the leading intellect in

---

33 ibid.

34 Kuhn, p. 93.

developing this framework has been David Zarefsky. To Zarefsky, the scientific metaphor, from the perspective of the debate judge, means to examine the resolution as a scientific hypothesis.

3. DISCONFIRMING ROLE OF THE NEGATIVE

Since the object of examination is the single hypothesis found in the resolution, the task involves no specific obligations on the part of the negative other than to disprove that hypothesis. They may do this by merely disconfirming the logic presented in defense of the hypothesis, or by "presenting examples and empirical structures of their own to demonstrate the falseness of the hypothesis. Unlike policy making, where the negative is obligated to present a single policy for comparison, the hypothesis testing paradigm allows the negative several options: to have no example or a policy, to introduce one policy to disconfirm the hypothesis, or to present MANY policies in an attempt to disconfirm the hypothesis. Zarefsky argues that this testing mechanism will bring us closer to the truth of a given rhetorical situation. He believes that,
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like science, argumentation "is a means of creating truth...that"
propositions that are accepted as true by a particular community or
society." To best achieve truth, Zarefsky urges that we adopt the
method of the scientist and test the single hypothesis only.

4. PREJUDICE IS AGAINST THE RESOLUTION

As with any scientific hypothesis, the resolution exists to be
tested, not accepted at face value. In any scientific statistical
analysis, the hypothesis is confirmed when its supporting data are found
to be statistically significant. Zarefsky, in an examination of
presumption, has stated, "I wish to propose the following reformulation
of the concept of presumption as being, not in favor of maintaining the
present system, but as against the specific resolution being argued.
Again, a scientific position on presumption is achieved by seeing the
resolution as a hypothesis.

b. USE IN DEBATE SITUATIONS

As a judge of academic debate for many years, I have often heard
hypothesis testing called into being in a round, and not only when I was
judging the students of Prof. Zarefsky or his theoretical followers.

38
Ibid.

39
Debaters tend to be very opportunistic on items of theory, and hypothesis testing has been called upon whenever it has been seen as strategically advantageous.

1. DECIDE PRESUMPTION ISSUES

When the affirmative team has attempted to show that presumption, for whatever reason, lies with the resolution or their particular proposal, negative teams have identified themselves with hypothesis testing to counter this. In hypothesis testing, presumption always rests with rejection of the resolution, just as in science presumption always rests with the null hypothesis. Thus, a negative team would urge that in a very close debate they should win because they retain presumption under hypothesis testing.

2. ADVOCACY OF MULTIPLE SYSTEMS

Often the negative finds being limited to one system too confining. Their response is often to offer a number of "conditional" or "hypothetical" counterplans. They offer these as independent reasons to reject the hypothesis, and yet feel that they do not need to really "advocate" or "defend" them because they are not their "policy." Simply stated, the "policy" of the negative under hypothesis testing is to DISPROVE THE RESOLUTION HOWEVER THEY CAN. If any possible negative suggestion blunts the truth of the resolution, it should be disconfirmed.
Thus, the negative often uses hypothesis testing as a rationale for discarding positions or arguments they no longer find appealing later in the debate. After all, these were only attempts to disconfirm the resolution.

3. APPEAL TO SCIENTIFIC BIAS

Debaters will utilize the scientific metaphors of hypothesis testing to appeal to judges. The role of "rational scientist" is often an attractive one, and debaters will attempt to make it sound as attractive as possible as they urge the judge to assume this role and, supposedly, vote for them. Our age has been called an "age of technology" in which our rates are often in the hands of "experts" and "scientists." Naturally, a judge might find a "scientific" approach to the topic quite appealing considering the massive changes science has wrought on our society and the gigantic power that science plays over each of our living days. Students are certainly not beyond making the "metaphor" or scientific decision making attractive when they describe hypothesis testing.

4. PRELUDE TO JUSTIFICATION ARGUMENTS

Since the resolution is seen as a hypothesis, it is either confirmed or disconfirmed. This also implies that if part of the hypothesis is disconfirmed, the entire of it cannot be confirmed. Therefore, negative teams often argue that a portion of a hypothesis is
not confirmed.

They do this through what have become known as "justification" arguments. For example, a negative team argues that the portion of the resolution/hypothesis calling for "federal" action is not justified, because other levels of government can deal with the problem as well. Thus, if there is no reason to confirm a "federal" solution, the hypothesis in general must be disconfirmed.

I have voted negative on such justification arguments many times, but rarely when an alternative paradigm is argued. Usually a negative team can gain a decision on "justification" only after winning the reasonability of a hypothesis testing paradigm, or at least some of its principles.

3. TABLA RASA

a. BASIC TENETS

"Tabla rasa" means blank slate — a recording device which can be written on, but before being used has no content in and of itself. It is a channel for communication, but certainly is not a source of information. One very popular debate paradigm is modeled after this concept, where the judge in the debate round is thought of as a blank flow charting mechanism to receive the content of the round. Perhaps the
individual most identified with this paradigm is Walter Ulrich. Ulrich, however, cites Arnold to describe the paradigm. Arnold writes in his 1974 judging philosophy statement:

The basic premise of the (tabula rasa) judging philosophy is that the judge enters the debate tabula rasa, to determine the outcome solely on the basis of argumentation in the round. An obvious corollary is that debate theory is a debatable issue. If there is conflict in the round over theory, (the judge should) resolve it on the basis of the theoretical issues discussed. (The judge) will also judge a round on the basis of criteria accepted by both teams, even if (he/she) personally disagree(s) with these criteria. (The judge should) impose (his/her) standards only if there is conflict within the debate that is not resolved by the argumentation in the round.

Cox identifies tabula rasa judges on the basis of their desire to judge a round on the bases of criteria accepted by both teams. Cox quotes one critic as noting that tabula rasa implies dealing with the other paradigms by writing in the judge philosophy booklet:

If the two teams insist that I am a chooser between competing policy options, I try to operate on the assumption of that role. If the two teams appeal consistently on the basis of who is doing the "better overall job" in the round, I look at the debate that way.
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Thus, tabula rasa may very well not be a paradigm in and of itself, but an urging for judges and debaters to be open to consideration of all or the paradigms. However, because its advocates refer to it as a paradigm and because it is named by a significant number of judges as the paradigm they utilize, it will be considered as such.

1. LET THE DEBATE HAPPEN

In general, the tabula rasa paradigm argues that the judge should be an objective and unbiased recipient during the debate round. The concern is that too often judges bring their biases and personal beliefs into the round, thus voting one way or another because it "just isn't true," or "that would be Communism," or any number of reasons indicating that the decision was influenced not by the actions of the students but by the mind set or the judge during the round. Tabula rasa advocates would encourage judges to just sit back and receive the data in the debate.

2. LET THE DEBATERS DECIDE

Within specific areas of concern, the tabula rasa paradigm would ask that concepts outside of the content of the current debate not be brought in. For example, if a judge were trying to determine which piece of evidence would be better to prove a point, the judge should only use criteria presented by the debaters. If one piece of evidence is eight or nine years older than another, the judge should not use date as a criteria for comparison unless asked to do so by the debaters.
Conversely, if one team argued that their source was "more inform" than their opponent's source, even if it was clearly not true in the judge's mind, that criteria should be left to stand. Thus, standards must be argued in the round, or at least presented.

3. AVOID INTERNAL JUDGEMENTS WHEN COMPARING ARGUMENTS

Understanding what logic is and what the requirements of logical reasoning are has been a difficult task since before Aristotle. The tabula rasa paradigm, as a response to this struggle, argues that there is no way for a judge to effectively do this, and thus asks the judge not to determine which of the two contending arguments are MORE logical. The syllogism and Toulmin's model are abandoned, and arguments are said to have force if they give a "reason." What a "reason" consists of is never specified, and even then can only be done in much the same way that scholars currently attempt to determine what is a logical form and what is not.

4. THEORY IS ALWAYS OPEN TO QUESTION

Because there are few set rules before the debate begins, no theoretical burdens are pre-assigned. Affirmative cases, for example, do not have to initially be inherent, topical, or any of those things most debaters and judges expect. The negative may argue that they need to be a part of the affirmative presentation, and then the affirmative can either argue that they do not have to meet these burdens, or simply
agree with these burdens and then meet them. In any case, no special rules of the debate are implied until argued about.

Cox found that a considerable number of judges expressed willingness for the debaters themselves to argue theoretical constructs. In this regard there is already considerable adaptation to a tabula rasa paradigm. Cox calls this finding "perhaps the most valuable data for debaters who viewed the (NBT) BOOKLET OF JUDGES as a basis for audience analysis." 43

b. USE IN DEBATE SITUATIONS

As with all debate paradigms, the tabula rasa paradigm is used for a reason. Paradigms are not adopted and argued over because they appeal to a sense of aesthetic beauty, but because they serve as effective tools in winning specific debates. Tabula rasa has several uses — reasons why and situations within which debaters will advocate this paradigm for the round and judges will accept it.

1. TABULA RASA AS A WAY OUT OF THEORY PROBLEMS

When confronted with any theoretical issues which are traditionally assumed to be the "rules of the game," teams may now argue that "X is not our burden because...." The advantage here is that usually it takes a team longer to answer such a challenge than it does for a team to
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provide a "reason." Thus, basic assumptions of debate are questioned by a team in order to gain an argumentative and/or strategic advantage.

2. COUNTER-INUTITIVE ARGUMENTS

Often debaters wish to argue things that clearly are not true — they make arguments which clearly violate most of the experience of our lives. For example, I observed a team at the National Debate Tournament argue that right wing wealthy landowners in 1981 El Salvador were willingly turning their land over to poor peasants and joining them by working in the fields of new communes. Frankly, you do not have to have a Marxist view of history to doubt this statement. In a tabula rasa paradigm, I would accept this until answered. Another example would be the statement by another team in 1981 that if the President of the U.S. surrendered to the Soviets voluntarily and asked them to occupy us, both high ranking military officers and citizens would joyfully accept this act without violence. The point is that when tabula rasa asks a judge to set aside his/her own beliefs, it must be done TOTALLY.

3. PLEA FOR FAIRNESS AND IMPARTIALITY

The most effective appeal for tabula rasa has been one for fairness — judge the students on the basis of their performance, not the judge's heritage. Students, so the argument goes, can change, control and learn from their own actions, but should not be penalized and influenced by the personal attributes of the judge, something they cannot control.
perhaps even know. This is a persuasive argument, and is usually posited next to a counterintuitive argument as explained above.

4. ABJICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY BY THE JUDGE.

It is certainly easier for judges to blame inadequate performance on students than it is to blame it on themselves. The tabula rasa paradigm allows judges to abdicate all responsibility, and merely to “decide” the debate without being “responsible” for it. Since current academic debate is a very competitive activity, and because considerable pressure and tension often accompanies the decisions made, it is attractive for judges to take the tabula rasa way out. It is also a way for them to resolve all paradigmatic questions the round might raise. Instead of deciding what debate is and should be, the whole question can be avoided.

4. THE STUCA ISSUES PARADIGM

a. BASIC TENETS

The stock issues paradigm is interesting in its genesis. Over the years, certain argumentative devices have come to be thought of as “supersymbols,” or words and phrases indicating broad concepts. Examples of this would be: inherency, significance, topicality, etc. A number of judges have taken the position that these are the enduring issues in any debate, and these need to be considered by the debaters.
Specifically, Robert Gass has attempted to together the stock issues perspective. Some of the characteristics of this paradigm are as follows.

1. POINTS OF STASIS

Central to the concept of stock issues is the idea of stasis. From the perspective of Gass, the stock issues approach assumes that there exists certain points of stasis, or "centers of controversy, which inhere in all policy disputes." Thus, it is claimed that POLICY questions in and of themselves lead to certain points of stasis. Unlike other paradigms, Gass contends that these points of stasis are "not artful products of imaginatively conceived metaphors, nor are they the results of carefully constructed analogies." Instead of these artifices, points of stasis are "necessary outgrowths of policy propositions qua policy propositions; they arise whenever and wherever persons deliberate about calls to action or proposals for change." Hultzen identifies stock issues in deliberative analysis as ill, reformatory, remedy and
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Rowland has equated these with the debate supersymbols of harm-
significance, innerency, solvency, and disadvantages.

2. STOCK ISSUES CAN VARY

While there are some stock issues which seem inevitable in propositions of policy, there are also stock issues which inhere to specific propositions and areas of subject matter. Thus, a stock issues perspective may draw such issues from any field it is discussing. Gass has remarked that "each particular policy proposition also entails its own particular subset of issues which are specific to that proposition." His examples make this plain -- different stock issues would emerge from a debate over national health insurance than would emerge in a debate concerning the abolition of capital punishment.

3. STOCK ISSUES INTERACT IN MANY WAYS

While there is some traditional indication of what some of the stock issues are, this paradigm presents little guidance in how these
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points or stasis should interact within the debate round. Gass believes that this is preferable, noting that in any given debate stock issues may be "emphasized or de-emphasized depending upon the particulars of a given policy proposition and its disputants, and they are often subordinate to one another." In fact, Gass does not see any basic guidelines in allowing the issues to interact, except that it should be determined in the debate.

I do not see any features of the stock issues perspective per se that would dictate predetermined notions about how these stock issues should operate. A stock issues judge is free to allow the arguments presented in the debate round to determine how each of the stock issues will function.

The concepts of the tabula rasa paradigm seem to be at work here.

Gass, having sounded much like a tabula rasa advocate, almost sounds like an advocate of policy making when he explains how a stock issues paradigm avoids the charge that it is a "mechanical" form of decision making. In rejecting a mechanistic step-by-step decision rule for stock issues, Gass rejects even topicality and significance as rigid guidelines. He calls for a variable relationship between factors, much as in policy making, and concludes with a position similar to that of Lichtman:
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stock issues judge could determine that an affirmative was probably topical, and then calculate the significance of the affirmative advantage while being mindful of the inevitability that remained. In short, I see no rationale within the stock issues perspective itself which calls for such a mechanical decision rule as that described.

These common characteristics of policy making and stock issues as paradigms were apparent to Rowland, who has written,

In the controversy surrounding comparative advantage debate, some argued that it is impossible to distinguish between harms to be solved and advantages to be gained. Many stock issues judges responded by recognizing the validity of the comparative advantage case and expanding their conception of inherency and solvency to include multiple probabilistic causation. The resulting paradigm is essentially indistinguishable from policy making.

Out of all of this one develops a suspicion that stock issues is a paradigm where concepts from several different paradigms have come to live together. This is a point worthy of exploration.

4. STOCK ISSUES BRIDGE THE PARADIGMS

In the stock issues paradigm appears similar to policy making at some times and tabula rasa at others, there is certainly a logical reason. Policy making and tabula rasa are outgrowths of the general
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system of academic debate in America. This traditional basis is more true of the stock issues paradigm, because the stock issues perspective stresses the notion of "what we argue over and over again." Actually, the stock issues paradigm demonstrates how the different paradigms merely emphasize some stock issues and neglect others.

Gass' point here is well taken, though, in that many of the stock issues are what other paradigms have in common. In fact, he contends that no other evaluative system is able to live without a set of stock issues for very long. "All of the paradigms found in the literature do incorporate some notion of stock issues into their perspective."

b. THE USE OF STOCK ISSUES IN DEBATE SITUATIONS

1. APPEALING TO A LARGE NUMBER OF JUDGES

The fact that many of the so-called stock issues are shared by various paradigms makes it a useful approach for debaters when they are confronting a panel of judges with different perspectives or if debaters are being judged by a critic whose perspective they are not familiar with. For example, McCroskey and Camp found that there was generally high agreement among judges, debaters, and even non-debaters on the major issues in a debate round as well as the classification of those
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issues. If the negative strategy, for example, stresses basic stock
issues in a debate, it should find acceptance along a broad range of the
judging spectrum.

While this is a very simple concept to explain, it is probably the
most important explanation for the broad application of a stock issues
perspective by debaters within debate rounds. This particular approach
seems to succeed in a number of competitive situations, and thus
captures the attention of the debaters.

2. ALLOWS FOR CONCENTRATED NEGATIVE ATTACK

If there are a number of stock issues "hurdles," each one of which
the affirmative must leap, a useful negative strategy is to concentrate
on the one stock issue on which the affirmative seems to be weakest. By
wisely marshalling their time and energies, a negative team might be
able to win more ballots than if they simply spread their attentions out
evenly. Quite often a rebuttalist on the negative is heard to say that
"we certainly have beaten their significance" while agreeing that the
negative has conceded innercery.

3. ADJUSTMENT TO NEW TOPICS
The stock issues perspective allows for some of the stock issues to originate within the area for dispute itself, as Gass has explained. In this regard, the search for new affirmative cases on a given topic may cause very "stock" negative issues to develop. For example, as a natural response to a topic allowing affirmative teams to address the issues of world hunger, the negative soon organized itself around a stock issue which was new for academic debate, that feeding the starving millions would only endanger mankind by causing overpopulation and a deadly tipping of the demographic scales. Eventually, this negative position had been transformed into a new "supersymbol," this one being called "Malthus." Say that one word and almost any debater or judge will understand what you mean. A given argument can become a "stock issue" on a given topic.

In ways such as this, a paradigm which searches for points of stasis is likely to lead to the discovery of stock issues beyond those we are currently concerned with. This sort of "stock issues" thinking on substantive levels of the topic is definitely called for and desirable.

5. CRITIC OF ARGUMENT AS DEBATE PARADIGM

In his analysis of the judging philosophies of the 1974 National Debate Tournament, Cox found that 15.5% of the judges identified themselves with this paradigm. These judges looked upon themselves as judges in a contest of oral argument. Traditional issues might appear,
but these judges primarily thought of themselves as evaluating arguments for logical validity, comparing impacts of claims, and testing evidence. As Cox quoted one judge, "it is the function of the critic judge to evaluate the relative proficiency of two teams of debaters in exercising those argumentative tools." One is struck by the penetrating insight of one judge, who observed, "what is real in our activity is the context aspect and the skills employed, these should be the basis for decision."

a. BASIC TENETS OF THE CRITIC OF ARGUMENT APPROACH

1. THE JUDGE AS CRITIC

Two very competent spokespersons for this viewpoint are William Balthrop and Neil Phillips. Balthrop defines this perspective of "judge as critic" by writing,

Three phases of criticism are description, interpretation, and evaluation. Description of argument demonstrates the capacity of the critic judge to assimilate arguments presented during the debate. Interpretation attempts to relate specific arguments to other factors that exert significant influences upon the force and direction of the arguments in a debate... finally, evaluation makes judgements about the quality of arguments presented and the moral position of the advocates. This perspective allows the critic-judge to rely upon his expertise in argumentation theory to produce a rational decision.
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about which team justified its position in a better manner.

Thus, the judge engages in these three parts of the critical process while judging a debate.

2. DRAWING FROM THE FIELD OF ARGUMENT THEORY

Phillips contends that the basic parameters of the critic of argument approach will come from argumentation theories. He notes that the judge should adopt the "world view" of the argumentation critic, and use these to temper decision making approaches from other fields. He feels that combining argumentation with rhetorical discourse is desirable, citing Pereiman's notion that rhetorical discourse CANNOT be separated from argumentation. Phillips contends that the debate should be an argumentation laboratory, and that the critic judge should provide constructive criticism on argumentation to the arguers. His conclusion is that by doing this "the activity can train more capable arguers and develop more thorough theories of argumentation for all of the potential fields exposed through the pedagogical encounters."

3. DRAWING FROM THE FIELD OF THE TOPIC
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While the theories of argumentation should influence the debate judge, some of the argumentative considerations should be drawn from the field of discourse itself. As Goodnight, Balthrop and Parson have contended, academic debate draws applicable notions of argument from the appropriate fields of science, administration, and others connected with specific topics and issues. Thus, the critic or argument approach asks for the judge to keep concentrating on the knowledge of argument theory AND the concerns of the particular topic at hand in making a decision.

4. WIDE APPLICABILITY IN DEBATE

Phillips feels that this approach provides an excellent match with his goals for debate and the debate situations he considers. For example, since he sees the goals of debate as providing a laboratory for the practice of argumentation skills and for the development of argumentation theory, there is little wonder that it meets those goals. Since his notion of a debate is an argumentative dispute between two parties, there is little doubt that this approach is widely applicable.

The issue here is the definitions used. If these are the only goals of debate, certainly this paradigm is an acceptable one. Disagreement with the notion of being limited to these goals alone,
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however, does provide insight as to why this paradigm breaks down.

D. USE IN DEBATE SITUATIONS

1. USED BY JUDGES MORE THAN DEBATEERS

This particular approach is more often used by judges than it is used by debaters. This is not surprising, because of the role of the judges and the role of the debaters within this paradigm. In terms of the identity of the judges, it seems clear that most judges are members of the speech communication discipline, and very often these judges are the same faculty who teach argumentation classes. Surely a faculty/coach/judge is pleased to see the judging model utilized in debate match up with the content of the classes he/she teaches.

In terms of the role of the debaters in this paradigm, it is not surprising that they do not often use it, because debaters are often in search of paradigmatic tools designed to help them structure the various issues of the round, while the critic or argument paradigm directs that each argument be separately evaluated for its logical probity. It is difficult for the debater to use this approach as often as others, which more directly suggest a decision rule.

2. EVALUATING QUALITY IN ARGUMENTS

This paradigm can, however, be useful to debaters in some situations. One such situation would be one where the issue is the
QUALITY of the argumentation. For example, if one team presents fifty individual arguments, and yet the opposing team does not answer them, but instead presents only five arguments of their own, they could appeal to the judge as a critic of argument to vote for the highest QUALITY of arguments and not the highest QUANTITY of arguments. Debaters in this position might be well served to argue that no decision rule in the round is appropriate except that of judging who had the highest standard of argumentative skill.

3. ESCAPING FROM OTHER PARADIGMS

At times, debaters find themselves confronted with another team who wishes to impose a certain paradigm on the round in an attempt to gain strategic advantage. Teams faced with this situation would want to deny the existence of any paradigm implying a strict decision rule, and thus ask a judge to be a critic of argument instead of, say, a user of hypothesis testing. This is a defensible and reasonably popular paradigm, and might succeed in avoiding a paradigmatic trap set by a specific team. Phillips suggests that a team might wish to establish viable arguments for this decision rule, and thus allow the theories of argument to decide all issues in the round.

4. LINK WITH THE COMMUNICATION DISCIPLINE
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Debaters often use this paradigm in an attempt to appeal to prior knowledge of some judges. For example, if a judge is known to be a critic of argument in the debate round and/or as a teacher of argument during the school year, useful practices are obvious. For example, debaters might wish to dismiss various issues possibly connected with argumentative fallacies (reductio ad absurdum, post hoc fallacy, etc.) because these terms would be shared by the judge. Also, a team might wish to analyze specific claims of their opponents in light of the requirements or logical probity (as measured by a syllogistic or a data-warrant-claim format), knowing that the judge will see these as very viable standards for argument.

D. COMMON FLAWS IN THE EXISTING PARADIGMS

Thus, in the last section of this chapter, an effort has been directed at describing and explaining the paradigms which exist in academic debate. As a unifying factor, it seems worthwhile to offer a list of criticisms which can be directed at ALL of the modern paradigms we have discussed.

Rowland has developed a set of criteria by which to judge a debate paradigm. These will be loosely applied during my discussion, but are certainly not my only considerations. Rowland's criteria include: (1) a paradigm should be clear and consistent; (2) a paradigm should be fair; (3) a paradigm should effectively reveal the important questions which are under consideration; (4) a paradigm should fit the form of debate;
and (5) a paradigm should produce good argument.

In an attempt to provide a broad criticism of all of the existing paradigms, several issues seem to emerge. Our paradigms have failed us in the following ways.

1. THE PARADIGMS FRACTIONALIZE OUR VIEW OF DYNAMIC PROCESSES

Burke has said that our interest is determined by what directs our attention. In order to pay attention, it is necessary for a person to focus on a particular portion of reality. In academic debate, certain processes, events, and traditions in the reality are being viewed as more important than others, and then an attempt is made to relate the entire debate process to that portion of the fabric of experience by modeling the debate after a sort of "paradigm." Thus, if the judge is to adhere to the admonitions of the debaters for the judge to utilize "policy making" and the judge, then, adopts this policy making paradigm, other portions of the debate activity, which really have nothing to do with policy making, are left out, ignored, or distorted to fit this mold. For example, in a debate over air pollution, the negative may indicate that all information is not yet in on the norms or air
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pollution. The affirmative may respond that even though we don't want all we would like, we do know enough to make a policy right now. The reason may be, "The rational policy maker would act to preclude the possibility of such harms, even though the evidence of such harms is not absolute in its conclusions." Yet, if the negative team should bring up an example of falsification of evidence, the affirmative is not likely to urge the judge to vote affirmative because "the rest of the evidence is good," nor are judges likely to honor such a request. The reason is that an issue of evidence falsification is a special debate consideration. It has nothing to do with policy making. Certainly no government policy maker would veto a proposal simply because they used a "doctored" piece of data, but would still consider the merits of the question. If we adopt a paradigm of hypothesis testing, we might understand the relationship of the negative team to the resolution. I am not at all sure that we would be better able to understand the iterative and highly variable results of the debate process. The reason is that the explanation for the iteration of round after round of debate is a special debate consideration. It has nothing to do with hypothesis testing. The point here is a simple one: all of the available debate paradigms fail far short of comprehensively explaining what we are doing in academic debate. The current group of paradigms by necessity fragment debate for us. If we apply hypothesis testing, we may nevertheless often vote negative on purely semantic criteria when deciding topicality, which are imprecise and most non-quantifiable. If we accept a traditional debate paradigm, how can we begin to explain almost anything we encounter at a debate tournament in terms of what
debate is like in the "real world?" Most of the "common persons" attending debate tournaments have needed quite a bit of explanation of what is "going on." Speakers from the Ford Foundation, a financial supporter of the American Forensic Association's National Debate Tournament, have expressed year after year at the awards banquet the same sentiment -- "I found it hard to understand what was going on at the round I observed today, but it certainly was impressive!" If we apply a tabula rasa paradigm to debate, how realistic are we being? Certainly the philosophical debate about whether it is possible to separate the environmental and inborn features of the individual is a long and unresolved one. It would seem wise, therefore, to counsel anyone who thinks they can do something as complex as judge a round of academic debate without influence from their own mind set, to think again. If we are to take the tabula rasa supporters at their word, that they view debate as a "happening" that is judged merely by standards internal to the event, is this the kind of intellectual process we wish to urge upon our students? Do we wish to teach debate "in a vacuum" where anything is game? The intellectual traditions of the past deserve more attention than that. The list of possible examples of how paradigms fragment our view of the debate process is as long as the list of paradigms I have been able to construct.

Current debate paradigms tend to fragment our understanding and use of debate. While hypothesis testing is important in debate, it certainly does not answer or explain all that debate contains. We cannot interpret the whole by looking at the part. Certainly the tangle
or the seven blind men and the elephant is relevant here. As the world is a complex, dynamic process, so the total milieu of debate is a complex and dynamic process. Can we assume that a static and partial paradigm will serve us well?

Ernst Cassirer has argued that in the use of symbolic forms, the creation of symbolic superstructures should be undertaken carefully. For example, when using a form to guide the organization of other symbols, the guiding factors must inhere to the symbol itself, and must not come from outside the consideration at hand. For example, when discussing debate, we should probably not follow the practices of botany. Most would agree with this statement, yet many are anxious to structure debate around equally foreign metaphors, such as science, administration, and the like. Some paradigms rightly see these as being legitimate concerns as well, but most paradigms are futile attempts to overextend these basic metaphors.

The world is a vast, dynamic, and complex process. We must not teach students to cope with it by leading them into intellectual fields of battle where they use only paradigmatic tunnel vision. As the nature of the world is changing — expanding in terms of inter-relatedness, rate of change, and amount of data available and relevant — we must teach students to broaden, not narrow, their vision.

2. COUNTERPRODUCTIVE PRETENSIONS OF REAL SIGNIFICANCE

Fantasy can be a serious business, but it certainly is not something which we should mistake for reality. In many instances this influences how judges perceive their role. Many have confided that during the round they actually think of themselves as “making policy” or “determining the truth” in a given hypothesis. As well, debaters have used such interesting lines in a debate as “this program will be adopted the moment you sign your ballots,” indicating a large amount of personal power held by the speaker, not to mention the fact that it seems to be a “bribe.” It seems clear that we are pretending to be, in many instances, not only what we are not, but what we cannot even really hope to be. No legislation is passed after a debate round. It seems clear that the best possible policy decision cannot be arrived at after a two hour discussion. During a debate round, “truth” is not arrived at, especially when you consider that both affirmative and negative teams gain victories in a given year and at a given tournament.

The point to be emphasized is that we must not adopt an anti-Popeye paradigm — “I am what I am not.” Students can benefit considerably in the use of role playing in education, yet our paradigms create roles for them which are not only highly irrelevant but specifically inadequate to the situation. In anything, the use of such paradigms teaches students a sense of frustration — the role they are cast in is not adequate for their needs. While this may be an important feature in dealing with the difficulties of modern life, it is certainly a lesson we need to
OVERCOME, not SURRENDER to. Regrettably, this problem will make it apparent to the student as life experience accumulates. We need a more realistic and less ranciful conception of the debate process. If a paradigm is to be applicable, it should be something we can ACTUALLY DO as opposed to something we can MAKE BELIEVE ABOUT.

3. REDUCES DISCUSSION OF SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

One of the criticisms of increased discussion of paradigmatic issues is that it distracts discussion from other types of issues. This leads to the question of how we can divide the issues into two camps, and what impact does this have on the debate process and the issue of paradigms as discussed here?

There seem to be two sorts of issues discussed in a debate round: substantive and procedural issues. By substantive issues I mean those arguments made by debaters concerning the nature of the question at hand -- the topic. Examples would include: consideration of costs, specifications of benefits, facts of a given situation, the reaction of citizens to a given proposal, and other issues in the same vein.

By procedural issues I mean those arguments made by debaters concerning the nature of the activity at hand -- discussions of the procedure through which the debate itself takes place. Issues such as admissibility of arguments made in last rebuttal, the technical requirements of the affirmative to support the resolution, issues about
how the judge should utilize the substantive arguments to make a decision, and certainly, woven throughout and within all of these, the subject of which paradigm the debate should take place within.

Both of these issues seem to be important for students to be discussing. However, since the time allowed each team is finite, choices made to discuss procedural issues must necessarily restrict the time available for discussing substantive issues.

The complaint emerging from the expansion of the role of procedural issues in debate has been that it has forced a more shallow approach to substantive issues. Zareisky and Mincberg have argued that increased discussion of theory has led to a neglect of the more substantive issues. In fact, they wonder if a debate round is an appropriate place at all for such discussions. These substantive issues, it seems to some, are more important to discuss because they are connected to "real life" more than procedural issues. This seems NOT to be a valid objection. Certainly deciding about what procedure to use in the conduct of particular human events is a very important task and we should work to develop skills in making such decisions. American government, legal tradition, business activities, and academic studies
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have been built with considerable concern for "process." Indeed, attempts by enlightened human thinkers to deal with the problems of humanity have centered on a holistic or systems approach to problems. Bronowski, for example, stressed the practical and theoretical similarities between the arts and the sciences in developing a unitary view of human creativity. Jiddu Krishnamurti has stressed the holistic view of the individual within a world system. Ivan Illich has stressed the importance of understanding the whole or society's institutions as important to understanding the role of man on earth. In relating this view to debate, Klump, Brock, et al., for example, were determined to look at academic debate as a systemic whole. If we are to understand the complex, dynamic processes we need to teach such methods of union. Thus, we can conclude that the discussion of procedural issues should be acknowledged in academic debate.


The problems with debating process, however, return to our original difficulty -- interfacing our procedural discussions so that they relate to real life experience. It is here that the current group of debate paradigms gets in the way. Do our paradigms sufficiently relate to the sorts of procedures we are discussing? Are we really involving students in policy making or hypothesis testing? Is it necessary to reject one for the other? Shouldn't our discussions of procedure embody both hypothesis testing and policy making?

One wonders, how can any existing paradigm teach effective process argumentation? Yet, explanation of a suitable paradigm to accomplish all of this, and thus allow a sensible discussion of both substance and procedure, is more difficult to come up with. Gaming as a paradigm for academic debate, as we shall observe later, addresses these concerns.

4. BLOCKS DEBATE OFF FROM OTHER DISCIPLINES

For a field to be given some intellectual integrity, it must be able to explain what it is all about. To share what we know and discover in academic debate, we must be able to translate it into some composite body of knowledge. However, there is considerable disagreement and discussion about what academic debate is really all about.

This is not to say that there is no agreement on some items. The American Forensic Association sponsored a development conference on
forensics, and out of this conference came the conclusion that forensic activity and academic debate in particular were "communication" and "education" at the same time. While this is a starting point, it hardly serves the purpose of explaining what we are all about. It provides guidelines, and certainly these are two assumptions that I strongly share, however, once we go deeper into the debate process, a more comprehensive theory is necessary.

When we examine the paradigms currently in use in academic debate, they are hardly the kinds of "ways of knowing" that we would be proud to share with scholars from other fields. Perhaps most embarrassing is the realization that these paradigms are conflicting and often mutually exclusive. This is not to say that conflict is not valuable, but that such continuous opposition has not been resolved.

Perhaps this objection is out of a concern to "legitimize" the field of academic debate in the eyes of others, but this is hardly just an egotistical concern. Academic debate must compete within the educational system for funds and time, and to do this it needs a more defensible, more explainable, and more understandable body of theory. My earlier objection about pretensions of real significance applies here -- it is hard to take ourselves seriously, or for others to take us seriously, when we are engaging in some "policy making" or "tabula rasa"
5. **DON'T EXPLAIN THE COMPETITIVE FORMAT**

As has already been indicated, debate is a competitive activity. Teams compete against each other, and a large amount of effort is put into "winning," and great attention is paid to win/loss record. Some have complained that there is too much emphasis on competition. Nevertheless, it is a fact of life in academic debate.

It is hard to find a rationale for competition within the existing group of paradigms. They simply do not explain why we compete, win, and lose. Scientific hypothesis testing is not a competitive, but a cooperative, activity. Governmental policy making is usually a process of compromise. Stock issues reappear again and again, but no stock issue explains the stock situation of academic debate -- competition. Only tabia rasa accepts competition by asking judges to be totally impartial, but then provides no solid set of standards within which to implement competitive decision making.

In order to be truly explanatory, a paradigm must have as important a place for competition as the actual activity has. Thus, competition must be an integral part of any acceptable paradigm, and certainly none of the existing paradigms accomplishes this. Gaming, however, does seem to offer a proper place for competition within a debate paradigm, as I will attempt to demonstrate later.
6. NO WAY TO INTEGRATE PARADIGMS

While my critique of current paradigms has been varied, I have never claimed that any given paradigm has NO legitimate points to make. There is no doubt that very good arguments can be made for the value of policy making as a paradigm during a debate, as well as for the other paradigms. My complaint has rarely been that paradigms do not fit SOME of the details of debate, but that they rarely fit ALL or even MOST of the details.

The paradigmatic need seems to be for an overarching theory which fits in the various paradigms as they are called for, includes them, and does more besides to give theoretical guidance to debate. This is a challenge I will attempt to meet later, but for now the need for such structure is as clear as the failure of existing paradigms to supply it.

7. NO DIRECT LINKS TO THE REST OF THE COMMUNICATION DISCIPLINE

Academic debate takes place, tautologically, within the educational system. The portion of the academic field most often identified with debate is communication. It is communication departments which run most of debate. It is often communication faculty who coach debate teams. It is within communication departments that courses in debate are offered. Yet, paradigmatically, there is little theoretical link between academic debate and communication theory. Policy making, hypothesis testing, stock issues and all of the paradigms except that of
critic of argument, borrow mostly from another field.

It is my contention that there needs to be closer affinity between communication theory and debate theory. There are some links in terms of speaking styles and theories of argument, but these all operate on the micro level for debate, they do not explain, overall, what is taking place during the round. A new paradigm must grow out of communication theory itself, and reflect a process of communication.

8. THE PARADIGMS BREAK DOWN

One way of evaluating a paradigm is to see how much it explains and accounts for. If it is a useful paradigm, it will explain large portions of the field it is being applied to. When a paradigm applies to only limited portions of a field, we might begin to suspect that the paradigm is not acceptable. Using an example from science, the Ptolemaic paradigm for the universe seemed acceptable to classical man because it explained events and the portions of the concerns at hand seemed to fit this paradigm. However, the heliocentric notion of the solar system only emerged when data did not fit the paradigm and humans began looking for a new paradigm for the planets. Thus, when paradigms are breaking down is the time to look for new discoveries and new knowledge through new paradigms.

---
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Old paradigms do not die easily. Just because they no longer fit the events at hand, this does not mean that those advocating those paradigms will not attempt to patch up the various holes and adjust the paradigms as needed. However, this process must be looked upon with suspicion, especially in academic debate. As Phillips has observed, a paradigm “should fit the field it is being applied to, not adjusted to a given field until it fits.” If this were not the case, then almost any analytical tool could be applied to any given situation or event. It seems clear that some analytical tools are better suited for some situations than others, and in academic debate the task should be to find the best paradigm(s) we can.

Any examination of the current group or debate paradigms will indicate that none of them really explains a large portion of the debate experience. Policy making is a phrase invoked in debate rounds, but between rounds no one walks around asking you “what kind of policy” you are making. Judge as judicial decision maker hardly fits the judge who leaves the debate and goes to coach his “competing” team about the arguments he/she just heard. Hypothesis testing may be invoked to explain the role of the negative team, but it hardly applies to the decision in the round as “truth testing.” No paradigm in current vogue explains more than a portion of what is done in academic debate.

---
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The old paradigms have served us well in the past, but are breaking down as we experience the present. Rowland has lamented, "A paradigm is needed which meets the unique needs of debate. It should be fair. It should be clearly explained. It should be a good mirror of the policy environment under discussion. It should fit the form of debate. And most of all it should produce good argument."

E. FLAWS IN SPECIFIC PARADIGMS

The general indictments already presented give strong indication that the current paradigms are inadequate as theoretical structures for academic debate. While a comprehensive set of criticisms has already been offered for each paradigm in a different study, some of these specific criticisms are worth consideration at this time.

1. FLAWS IN POLICY MAKING

While the most popular paradigm, policy making has been criticized, often by those who are admittedly involved in its use. As one who has used the tools of policy making for many years of involvement with academic debate, the following criticisms do seem valid and are part of
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What has spurred me to suggest gaming as a viable alternative paradigm.

a. NEGLECTS THE RESOLUTION

There are several ways in which the nature of the resolution is not served by policy making. First, policy making stresses a consideration of the "policies" of the two teams and not the subject of the resolution. The debate within policy making will involve a comparison of policies on a large number of criteria commonly dealt with when policies are discussed in the real world, but they seldom center on the issues of the resolution. For example, when a policy is considered, the cost impacts are important and thus, in the last ten years a powerful negative argument has been the financial impact of funding the affirmative proposal, even though almost none of the resolutions mention the topic of financing.

Second, procedural terms dealing with the resolution have no policy making comparisons. The issue of "topicality" would almost never be used as a reason for rejecting a valuable solution. For example, if a committee in Congress received a proposal that was not within their jurisdiction (a policy making analogy used by some), the proposal would not be rejected, but would merely be redirected but still considered on its merits. As Phillips has observed, these are separate issues in academic debate, and do not fit under policy making.
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Third, procedural rules do not fit into the decision rule advocated in policy making. Lichtman notes that these arguments, like any others, need to be couched in policy terms and weighed by subtracting that part of the affirmative advantage which is gained through non-topical means. Zaretsky responds that this seems a poor suggestion if the only means of achieving a nontopical advantage are through topical ones. As Phillips has noted, "this procedure presents difficulties in those cases where the entire affirmative plan must be judged as topical or nontopical." When this takes place, the judge would have to choose whether to gain a significant advantage by voting for an affirmative proposal which might have some "probability" or being topical or voting negative, thus not gaining an advantage but upholding a "rule" of debate. In other words, the decision format does not seem to include topicality, which must be considered an important "rule" in any system of debate.

b. THE DECISION IS NOT WITHIN A POLICY FRAMEWORK
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In the policy making framework, the judge can be thought of as a government official. Henderson has argued that a judge does not really play a part in the policy making deliberations, but merely arbitrates following a dispute since both sides have agreed to accept his/her decision. "The debaters are equally constrained by failing to have a vote following the deliberations. Thus, none of the parties in a debate can claim that they belong in the legislative mode." The result has been the creation of an elaborate and unnecessary fantasy. "As a consequence of this obvious fallacy, we have grown accustomed to calling ourselves policy makers, euphemistically evading the absent powers of legislating yet retaining the spirit of that mode."

2. FLAWS IN HYPOTHESIS TESTING

It seems that hypothesis testing is the theoretical whipping boy of academic debate. Many disdain it, but few have cogently explained their objections. In many cases where objections have been raised, I have found hypothesis testers to be most eloquent in their defense of this paradigm. To briefly restate the criticisms of hypothesis testing would be to say, as has Phillips, "the scientific paradigm (has) been overextended into the forensics field and has not proven adequate to
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meet the educational goals." Rowland has also indicted hypothesis testing. He has written,

Hypothesis testing developed in response to real problems in policy making. Unfortunately, the cure is in this case as bad or worse than the disease. Hypothesis testing is unclear, grossly unfair to the affirmative, misrepresents scientific practice, violates many of the assumptions of real science and does not fit the form of debate. It also produces bad argument.

Hypothesis testing is an inappropriate model for judging debate.

a. UNFAIR ADVANTAGE FOR THE NEGATIVE

Hypothesis testing allows a negative team to advocate multiple policy options in attempts to disconfirm the resolution. For the procedures of a debate to be acceptable, they must provide an equal opportunity to each side. The hypothesis testing paradigm, by offering a multitude of options for the negative against one affirmative option seems to violate this. Outnumbered, say, five to one, the one affirmative approach is bound to be damaged and less "probably true" in a politician's vote-getting sense than all of the negative options considered one at a time and in isolation. As Rowland notes, "This places an impossible burden on the affirmative. The negative may present five or six or seven hypothetical counterplans and need only
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neutralize or tie the affirmative on any one of them in order to win the debate." Rowland has charged that hypothesis testing leads to irresponsibility in argument.

...the hypothesis testing framework teaches argumentative irresponsibility. The perspective allows the negative to drop their hypothetical counterplans, disadvantages, and motive arguments as they choose, without harming their overall strategic position. This can occur because the negative team is not held responsible for all or the arguments which they present, but only those arguments which strategic exigencies lead them to defend. In like manner, the hypothesis testing framework allows the affirmative debaters to modify their plan if an error is discovered. The result is irresponsible argument. In real science or policy analysis there is no costless dropping of arguments. In the real world strategic exigencies force advocates to carefully consider their positions. Debate should teach students that they too must be responsible for what they say.

D. OVEREMPHASIZES THE EMPIRICAL

Empirical terms are often inadequate to deal with decisions. As Rapoport has observed about debates directly, "...it seems improbable that science can alleviate conflicts by settling debates in areas outside side its specific jurisdiction." Empirical analysis of the dimensions of a problem or concept will utilize the notion of "number,"
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and thus neglect those concerns which are not susceptible to numerical evaluation. Values, which are certainly central to the content of most communication, are one example. As Combs has noted,

In a world of rapidly changing facts and conditions, adequate decisions cannot be made on purely empirical terms. Action must be based on values and purposes that govern the choices people make from the kaleidoscope of changes occurring about them. Individual decisions about what is really important must provide a basis for that discrimination.

3. FLAWS IN TABULA RASA

While currently a very popular paradigm, some have offered criticisms of the use of tabula rasa. While the literature is very young on this issue, some major issues have developed.

a. YOU CAN'T BE A BLANK SLATE

Humans can be thought of as being influenced by two forces—their genes and their environment. The contention between these two forces has been considerable within discussions of philosophy and social policy for almost as long as such discourse has existed. This ontological issue is ignored by the tabula rasa paradigm. An academic debate is a large, complex happening, and it demands attention and

skill, no matter what the paradigm, if it is to be judged effectively. To say that each judge can now erase the memories of a lifetime and the influences of his/her biologic nature is dubious at best. Objectivity is an illusion and cannot be assumed or commanded. Bateson has argued that all experience is subjective in that our brains make the images that we think we perceive. "All conscious perception has image characteristics. A pain is localized somewhere. It has a beginning and an end and a location and stands out in a background." Bateson uses the example of someone stepping on your toe -- you don’t experience the actual event of someone stepping on your toe, but the images of someone stepping on your toe reconstructed from neural reports reaching your brain somewhat after the foot has landed on yours. "Experience of the exterior is always mediated by particular sense organs and neural pathways. To that extent, objects are my creation, and my experience of them is subjective, not objective."

When the processing to be done is of a highly symbolic nature, as judging a debate could be compared to having you toe stepped on, the possibilities of remaining a blank slate are even more remote. Burke has posited that human interaction through the use of language necessitates the influence of "terministic screens," the notion that the terms we use and are familiar with dictate our perceptions. Burke would caution the tabula-rasa judge, "That you may proceed to track down the

kinds of observation implicit in the terminology you have chosen, whether your choice of terms was deliberate or spontaneous." Since this is the most central assumption of the tabula rasa paradigm, and since it is the least supportable, these matters do incredible damage to its intellectual integrity. The truth is that this paradigm merely "asks" the judge to be as open minded and unbiased as possible, but that is true of all the paradigms, and what more have we gotten by building an entire paradigm out of this one idea?

Specifically, Rowland has argued that,

No debate judge could evaluate a debate without some sort of paradigm which defined the importance of different varieties of argument. The existence of the tabula rasa paradigm indicates that even judges who strive for complete objectivity need some sort of model from which to view debate. This is consistent with Kuhn's analysis of paradigms.

d. LEADS TO BAD ARGUMENTATION

Some have contended that the tabula rasa approach is destructive of the value of debate, primarily through a tendency to produce "bad" arguments. In making this claim, Rowland argues that tabula rasa

---


argumentation can be utilized by some teams as a strategy to avoid having to do the research necessary for a more conventional approach. Rowland is also concerned that there simply is not enough time in a debate to adequately discuss the complex philosophical underpinnings of theory. In short, a team might gain an unfair advantage by introducing multitudes of arguments based on theoretical concerns and backed only by some sort of flimsy reason. The problem is that it often takes far more time to answer these arguments than to give them, thus benefitting the tabula rasa team when they offer large numbers of relatively weak theoretical arguments. Huedner has related this to debate by quoting the Dutch historian Peiter Geyl as having written that, "It is well known that demonstrating an error demands more time than committing it." It is easy to see how debates become crowded by this condition.

4. FLAWS IN STOCK ISSUES

Many of the criticisms I have dealt with elsewhere were hinted at by Rowland:

Stock issues analysis should be rejected as a paradigm for evaluating debate. It is based on a metaphor drawn from the Roman courts of law which has not kept pace with the increasing complexities of debate over public policy. It is both unclear
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and strongly biased against change. In addition the argumentative world which it reveals is quite primitive and as a consequence complex causal relationships within and between policy systems are not explicated.

a. OVEREMPHASIZES JUDGE PREDISPOSITION

There seems to be a necessary conflict between the notion that debaters and judges can agree on a number of stock issues and whether the decision rendered can be objective. How can the debaters and the judge be sure of this before the round takes place? There exist no current communication networks for such notions as stock issues to be exchanged by debaters and judges. For example, a policy maker and a hypothesis tester may have very different conceptions of what the important stock issues are. Two stock issues judges, for example, may also disagree. Is a judge to impose some standards on the debaters and still remain objective? While Gass never distinctly states that the stock issues perspective forces judges to impose their standards on the debate, his language does seem somewhat prescriptive in nature. He writes,

...a stock issues judge is one who would find difficulty in imagining, much less comprehending, a policy dispute which did not implicitly or explicitly center around such enduring points of controversy. A stock issues judge is one who maintains a set of assumptions and expectations about the kinds of issues that are likely to be raised, and which ought to be raised, in any
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dispute over policy.

Gass demonstrates a very prescriptive approach while later on denying a "mechanical decision rule." As well, this statement definitely indicates the linkage in this perspective between stock issues in debate and stock issues in other policy disputes.

b. DOES NOT ENCOURAGE PARADIGM DEVELOPMENT

One of Gass' main complaints is that the "stock issues perspective has been ignored or overlooked in favor of more "trendy" analogies and glamorous metaphors." The reason, however, may be a bit different than Gass suspects. The search for paradigmatic metaphor in debate has been a search for identity. In this sense, an approach which indicates that academic debate is a discussion of a stock list of items, varying a bit from topic to topic, is probably not likely to attract persons in search of identity. Because a "stock issue" is something that has come up again and again in debates, it is certainly not often thought of as something which will show us "new" ways of improving academic debate. In order for something to be a "stock issue" it almost by definition needs to be part of the debate status quo, and not an innovating force.

}\h

---
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5. FLAWS IN THE CRITIC OF ARGUMENT

This is a particularly difficult paradigm to criticize, mainly because it provides very little guidance to the conduct of a debate. It merely puts a judge into a debate, assumes basic knowledge of the theories of argument, and then lets the debate begin. The guidelines expressed by this paradigm are exceedingly vague, in that it only advises debaters to "be logical." Of course, such an approach is assumed in all of the other paradigms, and probably by all of the debaters involved in the activity.

a. DEBATE THEORY IS NOT ARGUMENTATION THEORY

Debate as it is practiced in America deals with a number of supersymbols, as we have discussed. For example, for an affirmative team to win in most debates, they present positions on inerency, significance, and solvency. This is the basic format for an affirmative proposal, yet I would be hard pressed to find ways in which these processes matched up with units from argumentation theory. Specifically, I do not see a counterpart for inerency within the theory of argument. As well, the theoretical disputes which take place within debate rounds do not match the theoretical discussions in argument. Students very rarely analyze the premises of the opposition as if they were statements being examined in an argumentation class. I will have to agree with Rowland on this matter. He has written, "it is also questionable whether the theory disputes which occupy most time in
debate have any relevance to argumentation theory as a whole."

b. ROLE OF THE JUDGE TOO SUBJECTIVE

In this paradigm the judge is placed in a position of evaluating the arguments in the round strictly on the basis of pre-determined criteria for argument which the judge already has, and there is certainly no guarantee that this state of knowledge will be communicated to debaters before the debate. Thus, since there is no one true theory of argument, debaters are debating in front of judges who are imposing standards which the debaters cannot perceive. The judge then becomes too subjective. Ulrich has posited that a good measure of objectivity is not only "do you convince yourself that, as a judge, you are being objective," but also, "do you satisfy unsympathetic others that you are objective even when you do not agree with them?" If the mass of knowledge about argumentation theory is imposed on the round without the prior agreement and knowledge of the debaters, I cannot imagine the losers being convinced that they received an entirely "objective" decision.

F. PURPOSE AND PROCEDURE OF THIS WORK
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The foregoing discussion attempts to establish that academic debate is at a paradigmatic crossroads. Our existing paradigms are highly inadequate, and merely adjusting them further would be a futile effort which abuses the concept of paradigm.

There exists a need to outline a new paradigm for academic debate, a paradigm which can fit the form of debate, fulfill the educational and communicative purposes of debate as well as provide a foundation for further development in academic debate theory.

The purpose of this work is to propose a paradigm for academic debate based on gaming. This is not a small task. The several steps toward fulfilling this purpose are attempted in the several chapters of this work.

Chapter two will attempt to outline what is meant by gaming. Gaming is seen as a complex and integrated form of communication. To fulfill the purpose of explaining gaming as a concept, several procedures will be utilized. From the literature of both communication and gaming, it will be indicated how terms such as communication and gaming can be defined. Specifically, literature linked to gaming will reveal the various definitions of gaming, the qualities inherent in a game and the various uses to which gaming can be put. Benefits specific to gaming as a form of communication will be explicated, drawing on the literature of gaming proper and the literature dealing with gaming as a tool to be used in education.
Chapter three will attempt to outline a basic game of debate. Drawing upon the game design process as specified by Richard Duke, the conceptual map, purposes, components, procedures, rules and techniques to be found in educational games will be explained and then filled in in reference to academic debate as a game. This chapter should provide a basic "game manual" for academic debate as a game.

Chapter four will attempt to apply the game of debate to the paradigms and the indictments of them found in chapter one. Gaming will be offered as an integrative structure for existing paradigms which is acceptable where the other paradigms, standing alone, are not. This will be done by replicating the analysis in chapter one. The eight general indictments made against the current paradigms will be applied to gaming and the validity of their application will be considered. Each of the existing paradigms will be contrasted to gaming in an attempt to determine whether they can be successfully and usefully integrated.

Chapter five will examine the criticisms most often directed at academic debate and determine their validity in application to a gaming paradigm. This will be done through a survey of the literature critical of academic debate, resulting in a synthesis of these criticisms into major charges. These charges will then be applied to gaming as a model of modern academic debate to determine whether they have any validity.
Chapter six will examine the promise which a gaming paradigm offers for the future viability and growth of academic debate. This will be done through an examination of the unique potentials found in gaming. Gaming will be justified as a paradigm with considerable future potential through an examination of the unique abilities of gaming to enhance educational achievement, explore possibilities for additional theoretical development and to provide structure for an activity which is unlikely to remain static.

6. CONCLUSION

The task outlined for this work is complex, involved and challenging. Paradigmatic revolutions are usually difficult to accomplish, since they involve changes in habits of mind, vocabulary and intellectual tradition. While the task is difficult, this chapter has attempted to indicate that the need is clear. Hopefully, this work can provide a starting point for the creation of a new paradigm for academic debate.
CHAPTER Two
GAMING AS A FORM OF HUMAN COMMUNICATION

A. GAMING AS COMMUNICATION

As has been demonstrated in the first chapter, academic debate is closely linked to communication processes and disciplines. It seems appropriate to lay some groundwork in communication for a paradigm utilizing gaming which is constructed for academic debate.

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNICATION

If we are discussing both academic debate and communication, we need to determine what some of the characteristics of communication would be. This is done through an explanation of how communication scholars refer to communication and how gaming scholars refer to communication.

A. IN COMMUNICATION LITERATURE

Defining communication can be a difficult task. While it is not hard to isolate certain basic processes which are communication, there is some difficulty in application to specific instances. Mortensen notes that defining the term "communication" is not much different than defining any abstract concept. In terms of a basic definition, Mortensen notes, "In the case of the term communication, few would have qualms
about saying that it occurs whenever people attempt to use the power of spoken or written words to influence others." The problem, as he realizes, is that this definition is hardly sufficient. Does this mean only humans communicate? How about machines? Can communication be more than words? Must "influence" be intentional? Is thinking communication? In examining one hundred and twenty-six different definitions of communication, Dance and Larson came up against these questions. The difference among the various definitions was attributable to the way in which these questions were resolved. Dance and Larson concluded their survey of various definitions of communication by providing their own, which was "the production of symbolic content by an individual, according to a code, with anticipated consumption by other(s), according to the same code."

Mortensen concludes that an acceptable position would be that, "Communication occurs whenever persons attribute significance to message-related behavior." In support of this position, Mortensen offers a number of postulates for communication, which form the basis
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for our discussion here. These include: communication is dynamic; communication is irreversible; communication is proactive; communication is interactive; and communication is contextual.

In terms of the postulate of dynamism, Mortensen states that a dynamic system is one that changes when an indefinitely large number of particulars interact in a reciprocal and continuous manner. A dynamic view of communication implies a transaction which is not static, yet through all the fluctuations maintains stability and identity. There is an evolving and elastic quality to communication. Certainly academic debate involves such movement of particulars in a changing system which nevertheless keeps its identity.

In terms of the postulate of irreversibility, Mortensen comments that a man cannot step into the same river twice, as both the man and the river are different because of the act. Communication is something which takes place within a certain time frame, and it cannot be reconstructed, reclaimed, or changed. Certainly this is true of each speech in a debate and each debate as it adds to the total experience of those involved.


Mortensen also postulates that communication is proactive, so that when a person is involved in communication, he/she is involved totally in his/her dynamic person and immediate field of experience. Certainly anyone familiar with academic debate would admit that involvement in a debate is just that -- proactive. All of the attentions, thoughts, and energies of the individual (judge or debater) are called upon by the debate.

Mortensen also states that communication is interactive in that there is a reciprocal influence, which may take place on an "intrapersonal" or an "interpersonal" level. Both of these take place in an academic debate. For example, while a debater is pondering what to argue, there is significant intrapersonal influence taking place. As well, as arguments have to be refuted, there is significant interpersonal influence as debaters attempt to argue with each other.

Finally, Mortensen believes that communication never takes place in a vacuum. There are always background and situational overtones to communication. In an academic debate the situation can be very important. A final round of a tournament is certainly a different situation than an eighth round between two winless teams.

Thus, the postulates of communication seem to apply very well to academic debate. With some realization that communication, academic debate and gaming have a lot in common, it would seem appropriate to better explain what is meant specifically by gaming.
6. IN GAMING LITERATURE

Trying to define what gaming is can be a difficult task. Duke's review of the products currently available as serious games turned up some startling conclusions. For the most part, Duke found that "they seem to share no single characteristic: neither subject matter nor technique, nor duration, nor client, nor a configuration, nor paraphernalia, nor style." Games range from a mathematical input as simple as dice to as complex as fifty to one hundred people working for a week with a very sophisticated computer. Some emphasize role-playing, others see decision-making as a sterile man-machine concept. Some games mimic real world processes while others are totally abstract. Some games utilize a board while others have no visual aids. It is amazing, according to Duke, that "professionals have no difficulty in alluding to all of these as games." The problem is one of finding useful descriptors. Duke notes that the various cataloging efforts are "limited in usefulness because the descriptors employed are ambiguous and frequently result in a similarity or description of game products." The purpose of Duke's work as it is used here is to provide a useful set of descriptors for gaming, and it is his effort which will guide our transferral of academic debate to the language of gaming. Richard de la
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Barre Duke is a game scholar who is well qualified to provide such a framework. A professor of urban planning at the University of Michigan, Duke has authored a number of pieces on gaming. His game "Metro-APEX" has been utilized by a number of metropolitan governments as a teaching device for their officers and workers. They are presented with resources and authority, and then they react to specific conditions which come up within gamed roles the participants exercise their options and come face to face with the consequences. This particular game has been sponsored by International Business Machines, Inc. as an indication of how computers can be utilized in gaming and simulation. Duke developed a game entitled "IMPASSE?" for the National Museum of Design, Smithsonian Institute. Versions of this game dealing with rapid transit have been used in Hawaii, California, New York, Canada, South America and Europe to illustrate that citizens can understand and interact with complex social systems. Duke's game "AT-ISSUE!" was developed for the Environmental Simulation Laboratory at the University of Michigan and was utilized specifically by the Council of Monterey Bay for planning purposes. Duke has also been invited to serve as a fellow at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study, which specializes in work on gaming and game theory. Specifically, this work will utilize the guidelines set down in Duke's 1974 book, Gaming: The Future's Language. It is there that Duke specifies the steps which should be taken to design, implement and control a simulation game. The book gives no
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extensive examples of a model game, but generates general courses of action for anyone wishing to create a new game to follow. Since the ultimate aim of this work is to construct and then discuss the implications of a “game of debate,” Duke’s work is ideally suited to this task. It provides the useful descriptors which can be applied to the actual experience of academic debate.

Before immersing ourselves in the gaming language of Duke, it would seem appropriate to call upon others for a view of games.

One approach is to examine the concept of “game theory.” Game theory can be thought of as a subset of gaming. If “gaming” is that area or expertise dealing with all forms of games (recreational, educational, gambling, ritual and sporting games), game theory is a method of studying human behavior as it is acted out within a specially designed game. Rapoport has defined game theory as a theory of rational decision-making in conflict situations.

Models of such situations, as they are conceived in game theory, involve (1) a set of decision makers, called players; (2) a set of strategies available to each player; (3) a set of outcomes, each of which is a result of particular choices of strategies made by the players on a given play of the game; and (4) a set of payoffs accorded to each player in each of the possible outcomes.

Not all game theorists can agree on these elements. While noting that strategies are an important component of the game situation, Avedon and Sutton-Smith believe that although game theorists consider...

...only four elements in games, games would not be games without additional elements. It is important to recognize that of the four elements that game theorists identify, only three are really part of the game per se. The fourth identified element -- strategies -- is in reality not part of a game, but something players bring to a game.

Buchler and Nutini further explain the concepts within Rapoport's definition. They note that the theory of games is concerned essentially with games or strategy in which the outcome depends on the interlinked decision processes of players. They argue that "strategy" is a complete plan which specifies the behavior of the players for all possible circumstances and contexts that become relevant during the course of play. A "solution" of a game may be defined as the set of strategies which are prescribed to the players such that the outcome gained satisfies intuitive notions of rationality or rational behavior. An "outcome" of a game is the best that each player could achieve given the rules of the game and the constraints resulting from the strivings of all the other players to achieve their goals. Of course, there are simpler definitions. Atkins and Curtis note that "any game..." may be


viewed formally as a "structure" imposed on an abstract set $A$, where $A$ is interpreted as the set of all possible positions of $G$.

While this definition is generally applicable, it is so broad that anything could be thought of as a game as long as it had "structure."

A useful definition of a game is one proposed by Avedon and Smith to apply to games as they include game theoretical, educational and recreational games. They write, "At its most elementary level then we can define a game as an exercise of voluntary control systems in which there is an opposition between forces, confined by a procedure and rules in order to produce a disequilibriumal outcome." Some elaboration on this definition is warranted. By "voluntary control system" it is meant that the players submit to a given created reality, so that their actions will be "controlled" by the system of the game but at the same time it is completely "voluntary" in that players may withdraw. By "opposition of forces" it is meant that games involve different participants, and that these participants do not share the same type of powers in a game and/or the same goals in a game. Games are constrained by "procedure and rules" which govern player behaviors and game regimens. The game then produces a "disequilibriumal outcome," which means that not all players will experience the same outcome. In fact, a game
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is hardly a game at all if all players experience the same outcome.

In examining the difference between a "right" and a "game," Rapoport notes that a game is a struggle dominated by rationality, whereas the fight is not. "In short, the essential difference...is that a right can be idealized as devoid of rationality of opponents, while a game, on the contrary, is idealized as a struggle in which complete "rationality" of the opponents is assumed."

There are probably as many different definitions of "game" as there are uses for them. However, problems with definition certainly do not deter men from being compulsively involved in games. As Avedon and Sutton-Smith write,

"...each person defines games in his own way -- the anthropologists and folklorists in terms of historical origins; military men, businessmen, and educators in terms of usages; the social scientists in terms of psychological and social functions. There is overwhelming evidence in all this that the meaning of games is, in part, a function of the ideas or those who think about them. And yet for as long as we know, men have been playing games with great energy and involvement. So that apart from their own reasons for playing them, or apart from the reasons given by later scholars, the games have always had some compulsive necessity of their own."

For the purpose of discussing academic debate as a gaming activity,
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Duke's definition seems most useful,

Gaming is defined as a gestalt communication mode, a future's language which combines a game-specific language and appropriate communication technologies with the multilogue interaction pattern. This combination of components is unique among the various communication modes -- especially when one considers that it is presented to the participants in an interactive mode (as contrasted with the uni-directional pattern of film or television).

A consolidated definition of "game" which merges the views of mathematicians and behaviorists is presented by Avedon. This effort attempts to identify elements in games which can be discretely studied. These include: (1.) Purpose, or raison d'être; (2.) Procedures for action; (3.) Rules governing action; (4.) Number of required players; (5.) Roles of participants; (6.) Participant interaction patterns; and (7.) Results or pay-off.

A related attempt to understand the nature of games is that of Caillié, who has taken Huizinga's terms for describing play elements and attempted to create a taxonomy of games along two dimensions. The
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first dimension indicates whether a game is dominated by impulse or by control. The second dimension indicates types of opportunities for specific human experience. All games along the first dimension are LUDUS (subordination to rules) or PAIDIA (tumultuous, spontaneous activity). Along the second dimension, the taxonomy includes AGON (competition), ALEA (CHANCE), MIMICRY (simulation), or ILIX (vertigo). Thus, while all games can be thought of as having some of all of these concepts, each game usually is dominated by a ratio or two terms, one from each group. Thus, chess can be thought of as AGON/LUDUS (competition dominated by rules), and pitching pennies as ALEA/PAIDIA (chance dominated by tumultuous, spontaneous activity). While this is not seen as a rigid game classification scheme by Cailiois, it is suggested as a way to classify various expressive forms.

These two classificatory schemes, the elements of Avedon and the taxonomy of Cailiois, will be utilized in chapter three for a construction of a "game of debate."

There are differences between a game which is utilized to solve a communication problem and a game designed for commercial purposes. When we speak of gaming here we are speaking of a "game of debate" considerably different from a parlor game one would buy in a store. Duke notes that a sharp distinction must be made between these two game types, especially when a game is marketed for a profit. He notes that the "conceptual map" represented by many of these commercial games "is so heavily distorted in its simplification of reality" that the
participants in the game are almost certain to be misled about the "true nature of the system or subject under consideration." One example used by Duke is "Square Mile," a commercial game designed to entertain players by mimicking the process of community planning, but which really only converts this complex process into a simple-minded random string of events which conveys an inaccurate perception of what land planning actually is.

2. A COMMUNICATION CONTINUUM -- DUKE'S MODEL

In examining gaming as a communication process, some definition of the components of communication is necessary for us to determine how gaming theorists fit gaming into human communication in general.

While game theory proper has been very popular in several fields, it is nevertheless closely aligned with the communication discipline. In critiquing game theory, Rapoport has noted that game theory needs to integrate itself more with communication theory if it hopes to grow. He writes, "...what is essentially missing from game theory proper is a rigorous analysis of situations where communicative acts are moves of the game, and where effective communication may change the game." Game theory, then, needs to become a broader field of study. It needs to
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become more cognizant of the role of communication as it operates within gaming. Thus, within this work the game theoretical analysis of Rapoport and others will be applied to gaming as a human communication form in the hope that Rapoport's expressed hope may be better realized.

In beginning his definition process, Duke notes that "any given mode of communication is composed of three components: language, pattern of interaction among the respondents, and communication technology." Duke then examines a continuum of communication based on these concepts. He divides the continuum into: (1.) primitive, (2.) advanced, and (3.) integrated types of communication.

Primitive forms of communication include informal types (grunts and hand signals) and formal types ( semaphore, lights and flags). Advanced forms of communication include spoken (conversation, lecture, seminar), written (telegram, letter, book), technical (mathematical/musical notation, schematics), and artistic (acting, art, role playing) forms. Integrated forms of communication include multi-media forms (films, television) and what Duke calls "future's language." "Future's Language" includes three types of communication, again ranging from simplest to most complex. The first level involves flow charting and highway mapping as examples. The second level involves the use of scale models.

---
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The third and most complex form of integrated communication through a future's language is gaming. Thus, Duke has come to call gaming to simulate a complex social reality a "future's language."

Duke isolates six characteristics of human communication which vary across the communication continuum just discussed. These six characteristics have been selected "because of their particular relevance to gaming," and include:

1. Sequential/gestalt constraint - the inherent ability of the communication mode to convey gestalt or holistic imagery.
2. Universality/specificity - the degree of flexibility inherent to the language form in adapting to new substantive material.
3. Spontaneity or use - the ease or relative freedom with which a user can employ a given mode.
4. Mutability - the ability of the communications mode to be altered while in use.
5. Range - the range of audience who can employ the mode.
6. Message characteristics - the success with which a number of message characteristics can be conveyed, including but not limited to complexity, analogy, qualitative thought, quantitative thought, subtlety, permanency, precision, intangibles, time constraints, and system characteristics.

Duke then attempts to explain how each of these characteristics apply to the primitive, advanced and integrated forms of communication on his communication continuum. His contention is that each of these six characteristics are best expressed in the integrated forms of...
communication. Specifically for gaming, Duke notes that the nature of gaming is tailored to these characteristics and that specific components of gaming address these characteristics. A useful concept is that of "multilogue." Duke notes that within a gaming situation the players are assumed to be engaged in different roles requiring differing perceptions of the reality modeled by the game. Duke notes,

Because they are simultaneously engaged in this process, the message interchange pattern contains many concurrent dimensions and the term dialogue is insufficient to describe the process. Rather, it should be thought of as many parallel and simultaneous dialogues (multilogue), all pertaining to some aspect of a complex phenomenon. Serendipitous occurrence, both during the play of the game and in the organized critique which follows, will heighten the significance of these message exchanges in terms of what they convey to the player about the nature of the complex reality.

Of the various forms of communication identified on Duke's continuum, gaming seems to best meet these six desirable characteristics. In terms of seeking a gestalt understanding of sequential communications, gaming has the highest ability of any communication form on the continuum to convey gestalt of various modes due to the use of multilogue, the interactive use of communications technology, and a game specific language. In terms of
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universality/specificity, gaming can be highly problem or situation specific because of the use of a game-specific language. In terms of spontaneity, game construction requires a great deal of effort but use of the game is almost always spontaneous, often resulting in the creation of a new game-specific language called into existence by the presence of a multilogue demanding adaptation. In terms of mutability, during each game a distinct jargon will emerge, created by the players, as another example of the use of a game-specific language. In terms of range, games can be easily designed for a wide variety of clients, simply by manipulating the game-specific language through the use of supersymbols and differing levels of abstraction. In terms of message characteristics, gaming conveys gestalt of a complex reality as well as specification of various details through the use of a multilogue between participants.

3. GAMING AS A FUTURE'S LANGUAGE

Duke has chosen a relatively ambitious title for gaming when he dubs it a "Future's Language." In doing so, he is commenting on the nature of man's use of the "integrated" forms of communication found on his continuum. These integrated forms of communication have come about as a result of man's efforts to go beyond the limitations of the various advanced modes. Duke divides them into two forms: multimedia (slides plus lecture, for example) and a "Future's Language." This latter term is used to describe those communication forms which will prove of greatest value
in those circumstances where the need to convey gestalt is urgent. As Duke notes, "It is not being suggested that they are the "language of the future"; nor is it suggested that "Future's Language" is limited to gaming." A "Future's Language" is a form of communication which allows individuals to gain gestalt understanding of complex events with an aim towards dealing effectively with alternative futures. Gaming is one of these integrated communication forms. Other examples are waiting to be discovered, but it does seem that gaming is a powerful and useful tool for conveying gestalt while exploring alternative situations that would otherwise elude us, obviously an important element in learning how to deal with possible futures.

A "Future's Language" provides the participants with a chance to approach a given situation, topic or issue from any perspective which seems personally relevant. Participants may make their inquiries about the game at a level of abstraction which they choose. These features of "Future's Language," the ability to choose perspective and the level of abstraction desirable are necessary elements for understanding gestalt. This exploration of gestalt seems to be both possible and convenient in a gaming situation.

---
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Certainly this ability to convey gestalt has been one reason why there has been a dramatic upsurge in the use of gaming, since it has in the last decade diffused through the social sciences for both academic and applied uses. Duke notes that its growth rate has been explosive. The number of games being used increased ten fold between 1960 and 1970, and we are still probably at an early point on a growth curve that will not begin to level out for another twenty-five years. Duke concludes that as gaming begins to be seen as a unique communication form its use as a "future's language" will become pervasive.

B. THE VALUES OF GAMING

Gaming as a specific method of communication has several very important values. An attempt has been made here to explain these values, with emphasis on those possibly relating to academic debate.

1. GAMING AND UNDERSTANDING THE COMPLEX WORLD

It is a hackneyed phrase that we live in a "global village." Scholars, citizens, and policy makers are all stressing the increasing "interdependence" of the world. While we know that the interdependent world exists, we cannot see this complexity all at once, since it is dividedly out of our fields of perception. We attempt to manage fourth

---
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dimension questions like the management of natural and human systems through the use of our three dimensional senses and communication patterns. Comprehension is a problem, and communication breaks down. As Duke notes, "we are unable to personally encounter the reality, and therefore unable to communicate with one another, even at elite levels, about possible management schemes." The answer is in moving to the gestalt end of the communication spectrum.

Teaching students to understand patterns and systems is crucial. Bateson explains how our educational systems have neglected these patterns.

I was griping recently about the shortcomings of occidental education. It was in a letter to my fellow regents of the University of California, and the following phrase crept into my letter: "Break the pattern which connects the items of learning and you necessarily destroy all quality." Why do schools teach almost nothing of the pattern which connects? Is it that teachers know that they carry the kiss or death which will turn to tastelessness whatever they touch and therefore they are wisely unwilling to touch or teach anything of real-life importance? Or is it that they carry the kiss of death because they dare not teach anything of real-life importance?

Bateson speaks of a pattern which connects crab to lobster to orchid to primrose and "all four of them with me," and me to you, and all of us to the amoeba in one direction and the backward schizophrenic in another.

---
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It is this pattern of patterns, or metapattern, which we need to teach.

One possible answer to the challenge of teaching students about metapatterns is through different forms of communication. Duke writes:

"Whenever large numbers of people wish to become involved with complex problems, there is no alternative but to seek new modes of communication. The average human being has the ability to deal with complex phenomena when they are presented in a coherent context. We need not suffer the hazards of depending on an elite unless we are unable to find expedient devices for introducing the citizen to complexity.... Man must learn to control his destiny. To do so he must manage both uncertainty and complexity."

Gaming provides a good methodology for dealing with this complexity. Gaming is a device well suited for presenting dynamic models which are abstractions of complex realities. Games produce jargon which allow participants to communicate with each other with increased precision. They can represent future possibilities, or more properly, "alternative futures."

In planning these alternative futures, we need to manipulate various portions of these complex systems and ask "what if..." questions about man's future. If this is accomplished within a game, the sequence can be played out again and again, with the manipulation of the factors..."
to give us a better idea of just "what" would happen "if." Through modification and redefinition, better choices can be made about man's rough future. As Duke notes: "Man has not one future but many futures to choose from, but the choice is predicated on his ability to articulate the various possibilities before they occur. Gaming is one prospect for assisting us with this task."

2. GAMING AND HANDLING INFORMATION OVERLOAD

It is not surprising that we are experiencing information overload in our confrontation with the perceptible world. We are demographically condemned to it. Don Fabun has observed, or all people who ever lived are alive today, 90% of all scientists; the amount of technical information is doubling every ten years; 100,000 journals are published in the world but the number of journals doubles every 15 years. Is this a surprise to us? Not really, we have heard it over and over again. This sort of comment was not new in 1967, and certainly the acceleration has only increased since then. Yet, as Fabun concludes, we do not act as if we believe these statements. The need is for understanding how to deal with masses of data. In tracing the expansion of social complexity due to the increase in information, Duke has noted that the curve was
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relatively straight with a very tiny incline until about 1900. The curve
turns more vertical between 1900 and 1940, with a sharp increase after
World War II. Now we are at a nearly vertical rate as "change flows on
change at a totally unprecedented rate." New methods of communication
are needed to handle this situation. Duke notes, "There is an urgent
need for information assimilated as heuristics rather than fact since
the recurrent waves of new facts are too numerous and too fleeting in
duration to be captured and assimilated by each new generation." Traditional modes of communication do not lend themselves to
communicating heuristics. We need new ways of perceiving overview in
order to manage masses of information.

3. GAMING AND UNDERSTANDING DYNAMIC SYSTEMS

Scholars concerned with gaming as a methodology have repeatedly
stressed the potential for these techniques to convey images of
increasingly complex systems. Bremer has indicated that in world terms,
these more complex systems are the ones which are least understood...yet
most important. It would be significant, he adds, if we could understand
just a few properties of the system at a time.

---
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The need for understanding the dynamic social systems which surround us has been stated by Rhyne:

The interweaving of problems in this era has forced attention to wider and more complex fields by each decision maker and by staff or research efforts set to aid him. The mode of understanding that is needed is one of gestalt appreciation rather than explicit knowledge of bits of data. This is true whether one views the current macroproblem as a citizen, a responsible executive agent in government or business, or a researcher. The extent of the field to be appreciated and the contraction of the time available for doing so interdicts the normal, experiential way of gaining deep appreciation, so vicarious routes are needed.

The nature of dynamic social systems today is such that even the elite individual with considerable assistance experiences great difficulty in comprehending reality. The need is for new forms of communication which move to the gestalt end of the communication spectrum.

One example of such efforts is in world politics, where gaming has proven to be useful. Bremer notes that while the work in this field has been primarily theoretical and methodological, significant "islands of theory" are beginning to be brought together in one dynamic context. His hope is that "these theories and models (may) provide the basis for movement towards a satisfactory general theory of world politics."

---
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Gaming can be very useful for demonstrating the linkages between the major components of a system. Duke notes that,

...linkages are discovered during the play of the game, and they should be emphasized during the critique process. The pursuit of logic relevant to a given issue by a given player leads to confrontation with parallel but separate tracks initiated by other players working from different perspectives. The results of this interaction lead in serendipitous fashion to increased understanding of the total reality by each player.

Thus, through multilogue and varied approaches to a given system, participants gain an understanding of important linkages.

4. GAMING AND STUDYING THE FUTURE

With the magnitude of social change and the rate of change both increasing, we must confront the wave of "future shock" with some sort of method for dealing with the future. If we see academic debate as a part of the educational institutions of the United States, we must question how it is preparing students for the future.

Art Combs has observed that an educational system is influenced by its image of the future. The image of society and the future now existent in the educational system is far from adequate, and unless it changes this image, the educational system "will betray its youth," in
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the words of Alvin Toffler.

Gaming provides a very useful way of presentng the future and exploring it fully. Game theoretical mathematician Jaakko Hintikka has observed that although exploration of "possible worlds" had been a concept in logical and philosophical theories, it was especially aided by the concept of gaming. Even the study of "impossible possible" worlds is thus possible and useful. What is needed to confront this problem, as Combs notes, is a method for teaching students how to deal with new situations and new crises. If the method of dealing with crises can be taught, much will have been accomplished. The future cannot be adequately defined, thus we cannot prepare students for specific problems, only the rapid change and variation we know is to come.

Gaming attempts to explore the future through the use of an advanced analogy. One of the strongest components of language, analogy allows us to modify associations derived from past phenomena. The task now, as Duke sees it, is to develop analogies which are based on pure
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conjecture to formulate hypotheses about the future. "In short," he writes, "we must learn to reminisce about the future, thoughtfully, carefully, and in realistic detail if we are to select that future which best serves mankind." Any regular witness to academic debates over the last five years would have to notice this process at work — with students discussing the merits or demerits of economic growth, the population explosion, the mathematical probabilities of nuclear war in differing situations, and any number of other examples. Academic debate is operating, within a gaming format, to allow students to explore these alternative futures.

Gaming attempts to set up "what if" situations. A series of scenarios can be developed describing different actions, and individuals can act out a number of different roles within these scenarios. This "what if" character of games seems to be inherent in the nature of gaming itself. Duke has observed that most games have a setting other than a real and current time frame. Often they explore an immediate future, although some deal with past circumstances or alternatives to the present. "Future's Languages are able to achieve the transmission of gestalt imagery in differing time perspectives." Gaming can certainly
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aid in the task of educating for the future.

5. GAMING AND AIDING INDIVIDUALS IN BEING HEARD

With so much new information and with all of this information interacting in complex systems, the individual is faced with the conclusion that there is no currently definable stable body of knowledge. The educational system has been slow to realize the lack of a definable knowledge base, and desperately needs to find new methodologies to handle the information explosion and the accelerating pace of change, as Combs has observed.

Man has always struggled for personal control over his life. Most of this struggle has been against the elements in an attempt to meet basic physical needs. Beyond this struggle, there has been a continuing evolution of social institutions since the Middle Ages. Many gains have been won, but now they are threatened. Duke notes that the threat to our evolutionary gains is posed by the technical aristocracy, "the high priests of 1984."

At the very moment when man seems to have finally garnered the power to control his personal destiny, he has been caught unaware by the grinding pincher movement of the complexity of societal survival in modern times and the inevitable
Certainly this is a modern dilemma which a great number of scholars have commented on. The French philosopher Jacques Ellul, the social reformer Ivan Illich, the philosopher-economist Kenneth Boulding, as well as historians of science William Ogburn and Derek J. de Solla Price have all called to our attention the need for individuals to confront the changing nature of a technological society. Since the problems we face are far more complex than those we faced in the past, it has been assumed by some that these problems are not amenable to the decision-making habits of the average citizen. As Jacob Bronowski
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expressed thirty years ago, because people do not feel they totally understand the workings of the world, they tend to throw up their hands in dismay and leave it to the "experts" and the "technocrats." What is needed is a mode of communication which can allow individual citizens to experience decision-making and thus free themselves of this fantasy of isolation. We need, in Duke's words, a growing personal involvement, since "the solutions pursued today constitute a more pervasive intrusion in the individual's life." Gaming is certainly one such option. While not actually involving participation in managing world systems, it introduces citizens to the problems and demonstrates that they can understand emerging world complexity.

6. GAMING AND UNDERSTANDING HUMAN BEHAVIOR

There is considerable potential in gaming for understanding the behavior of humans. Rapoport observes that psychologists should be interested in games because they are a formal record of strings of decisions made by different individuals. The psychologist may be
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interested in the thought processes which underlie such decisions. Incidents of psychological interest emerge in games, according to Rapoport, not from the content of the situations but rather from their logical structure. The concept of rational decision in the game becomes more complex as we pass to more complex decisions and players have to infer more and more about other players. "Game experiments," concludes Rapoport, "can be viewed as research tools from this basically theoretical point of view, and may be considered as a method of generating, clarifying, and developing the ramifications of these hypotheses."

Even in the study of highly abstract games, knowledge of human behavior can be obtained. Bremer indicates the example of chess. Considerable research has been done on how individuals play chess. The question is, why would anyone be so interested in studying this game, which is merely an abstract representation of warfare and diplomacy from a distant past? "The answer," notes Bremer, "is simply that we hope to learn more about human problem solving in complex situations in order to improve and refine that capability at some later date."
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In some extremely abstract games, participants are studied to learn about the use of threats, the interaction of personality characteristics, aggressiveness and various bargaining strategies. The psychologist, according to Rapoport, may view a game as a model of a situation abstracted from reality, and cut down to size to be examined experimentally.

Examples of behaviors which might be important to academic debate are available. One of the behaviors often complained about in academic debate is the use of unethical practices. Gaming, as a methodology, can explore the implications of ethical and unethical behaviors, as well as help us to define what we mean by the terms. Schelling has concluded that gaming can aid in examining the interactive implications of ethical actions, the effects changes in payoffs have on ethical behavior, and the possibility of coexistence between radically different ethics. A second related behavioral issue would be the ability to react to the rationality or irrationality of other persons. Certainly in a debate situation a participant puts forth positions and tries to understand how another participant may make rational responses. Rapoport notes that
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gaming can provide important insight into these behaviors. In many different ways, then, gaming has emerged as a useful way of studying human behavior.

C. BASIC USES OF GAMING

There are several uses to which game designers may put their various games. Duke notes six such purposes: (1) systems exposition; (2) game-theoretical; (3) educational technique; (4) duplication of social interaction; (5) hypenated disciplinary technique; and (6) crowd-pleasers. It would seem useful to explain each category as well as cursorily relate each to possible application to academic debate.

1. SYSTEMS EXPOSITION

Systems exposition involves the representation of some complex system in abstract form, usually through simulation. In academic debate various systems are simulated, usually through a discussion of the topic at hand, and specifically through the application of the paradigms currently in vogue — policy making and hypothesis testing.
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2. GAME THEORETICAL

Game-theoretical games are those designed to describe and understand games as an extension of the mathematical theory of games as initially expounded by Von Neumann and Morgenstern. As we have seen, game theoretical approaches have been very valuable in studying human behavior. Certainly there is a significant amount of such behavior to be studied in an academic debate situation. For example, within a given debate various human communicative behaviors are in evidence, such as persuasion, argument, conflict and evaluation of communication.

3. EDUCATIONAL TECHNIQUE

Games are an excellent methodology for educating people. Duke observes that a game designer must consider whether the game is a suitable environment for self-instruction. If the game is irrelevant, restraining, or prohibits the player from exploring some alternative future which is of interest, the game has failed its educational purpose. A game must also contain enough interactions to educate about aspects of the totality of the game.
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Games match up well with the educational needs of the future. In echoing the concerns of Toffler, Combs has noted that we need to help learners cope with real-life crises, opportunities, and perils. We need to strengthen the individual's practical ability to anticipate and adapt to change, and to explore new alternatives when existing alternatives are unacceptable, whether through invention, informed acquiescence, or intelligent resistance.

As has already been noted, academic debate is primarily an educational activity. As gaming is an excellent educational technique, there is certainly a strong justification for cross-application of concepts between the two.

4. DUPLICATION OF SOCIAL INTERACTION

Through emphasis on the use of role playing and games of strategy, many games may be utilized for learning about and experiencing social interactions. In communication education, for example, games and simulations have long been a teaching tool used to educate students about communication by communication. Rapoport, for example, concludes
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that a "game of strategy is a model of a situation involving conflicts of interest." 165

As Buchler and Mutini state, "(T)he application of game theory should be of much help in solving the difficulties that seem to exist in the conceptualization of human affairs in terms of their sociological and psychological components." 166

Academic debate places students in adversarial roles and is carried out through personal contact, directly addressing each other. Certainly there is room for students to learn about social interactions by taking part in them.

5. HYPHENATED DISCIPLINARY TECHNIQUE

Gaming can be a methodology applied to many disciplines. Formal game theory began in war-gaming, and gaming has been used in urban-planning gaming, business-gaming, social science gaming, and so on. In academic debate, two such hyphenated disciplinary examples can be seen. First, the topic area serves as one such discipline, so that a topic about national defense would be debated as national defense-gaming. Second, academic debate is a communication activity, thus whenever a
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debate takes place it can be thought of as communication-gaming.

6. CROWD-PLEASERS

Play has inherent attractions to some players, and often games are designed for no other reason than the joy players experience. Many debaters engage in the activity because they enjoy it — they experience "fun" while debating. As well, many debaters like to observe elimination rounds or other debates while they are not participating. The simple act of observing is enjoyable. As well, many debates are held before audiences of common persons in an attempt to entertain them. Certainly, academic debate has its elements of play and crowd-pleasing.

D. CONCLUSIONS

This section serves the very real need of establishing a basis for gaming before an academic debate is put into its framework. The important points demonstrated here are that gaming is certainly a human communication activity, that gaming has important benefits for those involved, and that gaming can be used in important ways which relate to academic debate. With such an apparent match up between the notion of gaming and the actuality of academic debate, the next step in this study will be to examine how academic debate can fit into a gaming structure.
CHAPTER THREE

THE GAME OF DEBATE

There is an inherent dilemma in any attempt to apply new theoretical tools to an area. On the one hand, there is a powerful personal motive to postpone the construction of the theory until more is known about it and how it applies to a given field. Authors of new theories are often cautious, not wanting to risk ridicule and revelation of flaws from external analysis. There is a desire to delay until everything is in place. On the other hand, the construction and application of a new theory is, in and of itself, necessary for the theory to grow. The process of presenting new theories to others and the resultant observations on how given theories are utilized increases the total understanding of a field and a theory applied to it.

Designing a new theory for application to academic debate is a task which confronts this dilemma. The elements of gaming indicate that action is preferable to inaction in these matters. A significantly detailed micro-theory need not precede advantageous applications of macro-theory. Bremer, in referring to his work to simulate international affairs, has noted,

We do not have to await the development of satisfactory micro-theories before a potentially successful attempt to
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construct macro-theory can be made. In other words, it is not necessary to understand the behavior of individual decision-makers before we can understand the behavior of (groups) they represent; very approximate, simplified, abstracted characterizations may be sufficient.

In analogy to gaming in academic debate, all actions may not fit a theory of debate designed around gaming, but the values offered by the application of even a partial gaming analogy may be substantial.

168 Rapoport has indicated that it is the discovery of the shortcomings of gaming, in particular, that make theoretical work worthwhile. He writes, "...game theory is more important because of its failures than because of its mathematical successes. For it is the shortcomings of game theory (as originally formulated) that force the consideration of the role of ethics, the dynamics of social structure, and of individual psychology in situations of conflict." By discovering what theories do and do not account for, we become aware of our ignorance and profit thereby. Rapoport writes that, "...an acquaintance with several frameworks may serve to bring our ignorance to our attention. Awareness of ignorance is a step forward in the quest for understanding."

168 Anatol Rapoport, Fights, Games and Debates (Ann Arbor, Univ. of Michigan Press, 1960), p.111. Referred to as Fights, Games and Debates."

169 Rapoport, "Fights, Games and Debates," p.359.
A. DESIGNING A GAME OF DEBATE

We might begin to design a game of debate by recalling some of the
features of games which have been mentioned earlier, specifically, the
seven elements of a game as mentioned by Avedon. These seven elements
(purpose, procedures, rules, players, roles, interaction patterns, and
results) will all be dealt with at specific points in the game design
process as outlined by Duke.

Another concept worthy of recall is the taxonomy of Callois.
Utilizing Huizinga's terms for describing play elements, he defined two
dimensions of his taxonomy: one being whether the game is dominated by
impulse (PAIDIA) or control by rules (LUDUS); and the other being the
specific types of opportunities for specific human experience, such as
competition (AGON), chance (ALEA), simulation (MIMICRY), or vertigo
(IlleX). If one takes Callois at his word, that out of this taxonomy
two terms (one from each group) will emerge to describe the specific
game being inspected, then certainly this can be done for academic
debate. In the case of academic debate, it is clear that along the
first dimension the term most representative would be LUDUS.
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subordination to rules, since there are clearly defined rules in a debate round to which all are expected to adhere (such as time limits, topics, assigned sides, etc.). Along the second dimension, the two terms most easily identified with academic debate are AGON (competition) and MIMICRY (simulation). Both of these are important facets of the game of debate, but a choice between the two, as Caillois suggests, would certainly indicate that AGON is more important in modern debate than MIMICRY.

Thus, according to the taxonomy of Caillois, academic debate would be a game described by AGON/LUDUS, competition controlled and subordinated by rules. Perhaps it is this choice along the second dimension between AGON and MIMICRY which describes the different approaches one finds to the paradigms called upon in academic debate. Those who advocate that debate imitate some process found in real life are selecting MIMICRY/LUDUS as a game of debate. My particular choice and option as explained throughout this work would, on the other hand, emphasize AGON/LUDUS, since I am more concerned with the particulars of the debate at hand (persons involved, how their interaction plays itself out, the results of the interaction) and thus with AGON than I am with now the debate is modeled after some outside process, MIMICRY.

1. THE DESIGN OF A GAME

Duke suggests a number of steps to be taken during the game design process. Whenever one attempts to create a new game, there are certain
steps, components, and techniques which should be considered. Duke has developed these steps into a formal game design process. In designing a game of debate, these steps, components, and techniques are now explicated.

a. GENERATE A CONCEPTUAL MAP

The game design process begins with the conceptual map of a game. As conceived by Duke, the conceptual map serves as a mental blueprint to help convey the complex system being examined. The conceptual map classifies, sorts, and stores information; it also presents a heuristic language to be used as a common symbol structure. A conceptual map is not assimilated as a static structure, as it is built up iteratively over time as each individual is exposed to a number of game runs. Thus, the conceptual map here must, by necessity, be introductory. It must be recognized that the precise nature of the conceptual map may not be known at the time of game design. However, this does not mean that the basic objective of the game cannot be expressed in a written document to specify the basic conceptual map. But, as Duke warns, "failure to achieve this will most likely lead to an ultimate lack of precision in the game product." As well, the game design process should not
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proceed unless this phase is completed. The conceptual map is an explicit, thorough, unambiguous, understandable presentation of the system or gestalt which is being presented through the game. "Only upon the completion of an express statement of the conceptual map should game design be initiated." It certainly is no wonder that academic debate finds itself in a state of paradigmatic confusion — there simply is no current conceptual map.

The conceptual map attempts to convey a notion of the gestalt or the situation. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* defines gestalt as a structure or configuration of physical, biological, or psychological phenomena so integrated as to constitute a functional unit with properties not derivable from its parts in summation. As Duke notes, "games are successful for conveying gestalt because they employ a deliberate system of informational pulses through an organized gestalt (conceptual map)."

The task, then, is to build such a conceptual map for the game of debate. Fortunately, academic debate already exists in a great many places, so it is possible to call upon experiences in order to construct
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our conceptual map. This ability to gather information on a game already being played certainly eases the job of game design. Rather than start from scratch in the game design process, the task is to examine how academic debate would fit into a gaming framework.

A basic observation of what goes on in academic debates is that participants are engaging in basic symbolic processes. In creating a conceptual map to encompass these symbolic processes the game designer could utilize a simple list of principles to be followed or the game designer might explain the debate as a purely symbolic process. I would choose the latter course, since the game of debate should be closely allied with the communication discipline and because it seems obvious that the results of a given academic debate are never "real" in the sense of influencing the issues discussed within the debate. In fact, it may be cogently argued that confusion between the "game" and "real life" should be avoided. If we mandate that our "games" become a part of "real life," then it is also true that our lives will, in many ways, merely become "games" to be played. If we bring the important perspectives of gaming to real life situations, we may be asking for the utilization of a manipulative and gambling type of methodology. For example, if we think of the arms race between the superpowers as a "game" which they are playing with the future of humanity, now can this be comforting? In this regard, Rapoport has argued,

---
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The theory of games has made a sharp impact on my own thinking about conflict. ...I thought a decade ago that conflicts were chiefly outgrowths of classness or outlooks. I was aware, of course, that a game is not a conflict of this sort. But if it were pointed out to me then that a war could also be viewed as a "game," I would have dismissed this notion as gruesome. I was also aware that at the nerve center of the American economy, the stock market, a gigantic game was being played, and this too I dismissed as a travesty on human values. In other words, I felt that games ought not be played in certain contexts, for example, where human lives and human welfare are at stake. I also felt that the primary payoffs in those games, that is, power or symbols of power, were perversions or denigrations of human goals.

What are games, then? It seems that there can be little doubt that they are symbolic acts. While these acts are "real" in the sense that they are representations of the organism involved, yet games retain a very "dramatic" quality. Avedon and Sutton-Smith have noted that expressive phenomena such as games, play, laughter, babbling, and art are adaptive phenomena whose utility lies in their value as terminal representations for the organisms involved. As Cassirer has noted, "Symbolic forms are not imitations but organs of reality." If we merely look at what is purely functional in such behavior systems we are adopting a reductive point of view and neglecting what is important to the player.

This is not to say that games are only symbolic acts and
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nothing more. Certainly they are "about" real issues. As Rapoport
has noted, "most serious debates are NOT simply about words; so we
cannot, as a rule, expect the issues to disappear as a result of
semantic analysis and improved communication. But this preliminary job
of understanding must first be done to make sure that it is not only
words we are concerned with, and if it is not, to get down to the real
business." Certainly debate is a game or symbolic activity, but it is
usually "about" concrete issues. It is much like a drama, a symbolic
representation of reality which nevertheless can be filled with power
and emotion.

Since the debate is a symbolic activity, the conceptual map
presented here will utilize the elements of dramatism as espoused by
Kenneth Burke for a guiding model. Basically, the conceptual map can be
spelled out within the dramatistic pentadic analysis of Burke. Burke's
pentad consists of: (1.) Purpose: the reason behind the symbolic
activity; (2.) Act: movement and action during the symbolic activity;
(3.) Agent: the individuals involved in the symbolic activity; (4.)
Agency: those elements of the scene utilized by those involved in the
symbolic activity, and (5.) Scene: where the symbolic activity takes
place.

---
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Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives (Berkeley, Univ. of California
This work attempts to specify the conceptual map for the game of debate utilizing dramatistic analysis. While there could be considerably more detail within the conceptual map, such detail is not necessarily advisable, as we shall see during our discussion of "rules" for the game of debate. The conceptual map must be specific and comprehensive, but it must not be so detailed that it is difficult for new participants to comprehend. The treatment of the pentad will be relatively brief here. The conceptual map will then be called upon over and over again in the specification and discussion of the game of debate to be carried out later in this work.

1. PURPOSE

Humans are beings with a purpose. Burke notes that animals are characterized by random, aimless motion, while man engages in activities (and specifically, symbolic activities) for a purpose. For the symbolic activity of academic debate, three purposes come to mind. The first purpose of the game of debate is to provide an educational experience for the participants. Academic debate is just that — academic — and it takes place within educational institutions. The game of debate should help educate students about themselves, how their world operates as a dynamic system, and how they interact with other participants. The second purpose of the game of debate is to discuss the scenario. In common debate terminology, the scenario would be the "topic" to be debated. A nationally or regionally determined proposition is discussed by the participants. This purpose relates to the first, in that
discussion of the scenario will educate participants about it. The third purpose of the game of debate is to determine which team did the better job of debating. As we shall see, a judge is involved to make this determination at the conclusion of the game run.

2. ACT

Several acts take place within a debate. All seem to be part of or combinations of the following acts. The first act is that of speaking. within the game of debate, participants address each other on the subject of the scenario and the debate itself. Communication takes place through verbal actions, non-verbal signals, but not through written communication. At times, communication takes place through a question and answer format as well. Academic debate is an oral activity. The second act is that of listening. While some participants are speaking, others are listening. Part of listening involves the action of taking notes and utilizing a flow chart to organize the messages received. The third act is that of preparation. While other participants are speaking, and specifically during preparation time, some participants are preparing to make their presentations. Significant pre-debate preparation also takes place. The fourth act is that of evaluation. At the conclusion of the game run, a panel of designated judge(s) will evaluate the event and determine which participants did the better job of debating.

3. AGENT
Various persons are involved in the game of debate. They fall within the following categories. The first group of agents consist of the debaters themselves. The debaters are divided into two teams, affirmative (in support of the scenario) and the negative (opposed to the scenario). Traditionally, two persons make up each team, though this is not necessarily the case. Students on the same team are assumed to be working together in a fashion designed to gain them the decision in the round as having done the better job of debating. Traditionally, the debaters are students. The second agent is the judge. The judge is an interested person with or without prior knowledge of the game of debate who has consented to judge this symbolic activity for the purpose of awarding a decision to one team or the other. The judge is asked to observe the game of debate, make a decision, award quality points, and then prepare a written and/or oral explanation of the reason for the decision. The third agent is the coach. The coach works solely to prepare and assist one of the teams in the debate. The coach function may be carried out by a very active resource team or by merely a passive companion. The coach does not communicate with the judge or the participants during the round. In many ways the role of the coach may be thought of in traditional sporting terms. The fourth agent is the event organizer. Not a communicator during the game run, this agent arranges the contests between teams, either as a tournament involving many teams or as a one-on-one meeting. The event arranger schedules the
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game runs, provides locations for them to be held, and collects and processes the results. The 11th agent consists of the observer. Observers do not take an active communication role during the game run, and are expected to listen only, though they may express their opinions following the awarding of the decision.

4. AGENCY

Various elements and objects are utilized during the game run. They roughly fall into the following categories. The first agency is the speech of the participants. During specified time periods (stipulated by the event arranger) participants speak to those present on the subject of the scenario and the game itself. This communication will probably utilize language and non-verbal messages containing logical and other appeals to indicate why a certain team has done the better job of debating. This involves presenting new messages and responding to messages of the other team in a discussion of the scenario and the game itself. The second agency consists of reference material. The members of the two teams may utilize reference materials (pieces of evidence, factual material, opinions of others, etc.) in a discussion of the scenario and the game itself. Such reference material should be communicated orally although it may be available for judge inspection at the conclusion of the oral presentations. The third agency consists of the flow charts utilized by the participants. These flow charts act as detailed notes of the oral messages presented during the game run. They will be utilized by the debaters as organizational
material for their speeches as well as a record of the contest. Flow charts operate for the judge as a basis for reviewing the events of the game and arriving at a decision. The fourth agency is the ballot. A ballot is the document of the decision of the judge. On it, the judge writes the names and designations of the participants, writes the decision, awards quality points, and then briefly explains the reason for the decision.

5. SCENE

The scene is where the symbolic activity takes place. The first aspect of the scene is that it is a contest. Two teams have gathered together with a judge, and the emerging scene is one of contest between the teams which the judge will decide. The second relevant aspect of the scene is that it is an educational setting. Most often debates take place within a school or college setting. The debaters are students and the judge has agreed to cooperate with them within an educational setting. The third relevant aspect of the scene is that each game run may take place within a larger format. For example, a game run may be part of a larger tournament consisting of many teams. After a game run, teams may well go on to face other teams until a specified series of game runs have taken place. Each tournament may also be tallied into an entire year's results.

Burke's pentad offers a way of structuring an explanation of the conceptual map of the game of debate. It allows us to separate
important facets as to their function and role while at the same time allowing us to see how the different elements of the pentad influence one another. Duke advises that upon completion of a basic conceptual map, the game design process may continue. However, the conceptual map is the basis from which later emerging specificity will come. The conceptual mapping process must be well thought out in order to spawn useful elements later in the game design process. If faults are to emerge in this attempt to design a game of debate, they will most likely originate within the conceptual map just laid out.

Having briefly stated the conceptual map for the game of debate, the next step is to examine the remaining criteria for the game design process established by Duke (1974). In many ways, the conceptual map embodies the basis for game design, and the remaining criteria more fully explain the concept of the game. Specifically, the categories for examination offered by Duke often parallel Burke's pentad in their contents, though they are given different form and emphasis.

b. DEFINE GAME OBJECTIVES

1. PURPOSES FOR GAMES

while the objective of the game on a surface level is often play
and involvement, there must be some additional purpose for the game being played. Games are often linked to an academic situation, a public service training program, or citizen participation format where the game is really only part of the total picture. Duke has indicated four purposes for which gaming can be employed. While it is likely that one of these purposes will be more dominant than the others, Duke notes that most games will have two or more of these purposes evident in their structure. As we shall see, most of these purposes can be easily related to academic debate.

a. DIALOGUE: TO INCREASE COMMUNICATION AMONG A GROUP

Gaming involves persons and communication, thus a dialogue is established in gaming where a group communicates about a topic which is complex, future oriented, of a systems nature, and which requires a vocabulary and vernacular which is not commonly shared. Certainly this is precisely what takes place in a round of debate. Duke identifies three forms of dialogue.

1. EXPERT TO EXPERT

---

184 Duke, p.77.
185 Duke, p.78.
186 Duke
Often used by interdisciplinary research teams, which may include debate teams, this form of dialogue allows them to better understand a situation and to engage in more perfect communication patterns about ideas and concepts. While in a debate situation we do NOT claim to be "experts" in the scenario, many of us do claim to be "experts in debate," and our communication within the game of debate helps us to understand the debate system better.

2. PROFESSIONAL TO LAY GROUP

In this form of dialogue, the "professional" would start with some expert knowledge about the debate process or the topic at hand, and then use the debate process to educate opponents, judges, and/or audiences about these concepts. The need is to transmit such information in a clear and understandable fashion, thus shedding much of the special vocabulary probably used in the expert-to-expert dialogue. One can see this dialogue taking place in a debate where the negative team is totally ignorant of and unprepared for the affirmative case, where an experienced team is debating a novice team, or where the experience and knowledge of the participants about the game of debate or the scenario far outdistance the experience and knowledge of the judge and vice versa.

3. LAYMAN TO LAYMAN

Layman to layman communication is probably the most important type
pf dialogue established in the game or debate. Students confront each other on issues of great public import and engage in discussions even though none of the parties involved is a per se expert in that field. There are no "experts" to intervene, although debaters may enter expert testimony into the debate. Even though these "experts" intrude in the form of evidence presented, the evidence and the general positions of the teams must be spelled out and manipulated by the debaters themselves.

b. PROJECT INFORMATION IN TRAINING OR EDUCATION

Perhaps the bulk of all games available today fall into this category, at least in terms of their main purpose. Most educational, military, and business games attempt to train and educate participants in the understanding of complex and dynamic systems. The major purpose of academic debate is to train and educate participants -- debaters, coaches and judges. If training is so important for academic debate, then the crux of the paradigm crisis makes itself apparent -- if there is confusion about the purpose of the game and its procedures, the training will be vague and non-specific. Duke has observed that "when the primary purpose is to project information, it is particularly incumbent on the game designer to have precisely defined and to have clearly presented the conceptual map."
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C. EXTRACT INFORMATION FROM A GROUP

Gaming can be used to extract information from a group, such as their opinions and conclusions about a given subject. The game serves as a tool for making decisions about complex systems. Three different functions are evident here.

1. SYSTEM DELINEATION

As has already been discussed, understanding the systemic nature of the human enterprise is important. Bertalanffy has noted that coming to understand the world as a "system" will probably herald a new world of considerable impact. The concept of systems has become pervasive in society as more and more we are forced to deal with complexities, with "wholes," in all fields, such as political science, organizational theory, sociology, biology, physics, and more. Bertalanffy feels that system delineation is important because it might provide us with "basic concepts and underlying principles that may be valid throughout the entire body of knowledge... Integrative studies would prove to be an essential part of the quest for an understanding of
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reality...” His hope is that understanding the world “as a great organization can help to reinforce the sense of reverence for the living which we have almost lost in the last sanguinary decades of human history.” A game may be utilized to roughly duplicate a complex system and then to explore the relationships among the components within the system. Duke notes that games such as NEXUS have been used for such purposes, and that games have been used in areas as widely differentiated as urban planning and DNA molecule structure research.

2. HYPOTHESIS TESTING AND POLICY MAKING

Two other uses come out of system delineation to complete the threefold extraction function of gaming. These are hypothesis testing and policy making. Game literature illustrates that this methodology can be very useful in engaging in both of these activities. Oddly enough, hypothesis testing and policy making are also the leading paradigms for debate. Both are easily subsumed under gaming. Duke notes that there are many examples of games which could satisfactorily be employed for hypothesis testing and policy making. He suggests that some of the better simulations be put together in a gaming exercise, the
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resultant "linking of good simulations with good games could result in better decisions in the area of public policy." Duke cites ecological issues as a good example of where hypothesis testing and policy making can be usefully combined within gaming. Perhaps the most popular of the current debate paradigms is policy making. Duke believes that gaming can show considerable promise in aiding policy making. Noting that gaming for policy making purposes originated in war exercises, it has spread to business schools and out into the social sciences. Duke concludes, however, that "the most exciting development to come will be in the area of public policy." The example of the war room game illustrates the potential for gaming to communicate gestalt. "War rooms," according to Duke, usually contain a map and/or physical model of a region and supporting systems which provide other information. Usually the physical representation is kept current, and this updating makes it a dynamic process. Various accounting systems provide data. These rooms provide an overview or temporal and geographic context. These games can be compared to the game of debate. In academic debate the map/model is composed of the flow charts utilized, where evidence and prepared positions are the supporting services. The flow chart is kept current as sides make their moves, thus creating a dynamic process. Accounting systems (represented by the advantage/disadvantage impacts explained by the participants) provide information about the position of
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each team in the debate, thus giving indications of which moves need to be made next. Gaming in policy making has now expanded to include the entirety of man's policy decisions. For example, Bremer reports on various attempts to create world gaming models. And his associates created such a game for the existing world situation for the Department of Defense called TEMPER. Alker and his associates developed a game of United Nations peace keeping operations. Bonham and Sapiro constructed a game for the cognitive processes of foreign policy decision-makers. Bremer has continued development of a game for international relations called the INS, which has been considerably refined and tested. INS, for example, when played through almost always results in an arms race between East and West. Thus, gaming as a model for academic debate does not ask us to choose between policy making and hypothesis testing, but has enough room for both. Earlier it was noted that a debate paradigm should teach students about hypothesis testing, policy making, and more, and gaming seems to provide that new paradigm.

d. MOTIVATION

This particular goal of gaming is almost always linked with one of
the above. However, there can be situations in which the sole goal would be motivation. One of the extraordinary things about gaming is the ability of even weak games to motivate unlikely participants to "play" through a game which seemingly has little relevance. We would say, however, that the ability to motivate is an important element of a good game. Certainly for thousands of students and coaches actively involved in academic debate, there is no doubt that it motivates them. Duke indicates five ways in which a good game might motivate. Taking these and applying them to academic debate gives us some clues as to why debate participants are so motivated. First, a leaderless environment may increase motivation for gaming, and certainly academic debate allows students to act on their own -- no coach/leader can advise them during the round or during their speeches. Second, rapid feedback may also increase motivation for gaming. In academic debate, students often know the results of a round immediately after it is over, and they usually never wait more than a day or so to find out the results and read the ballots. Third, roles which are typically denied in real-life situations may also increase motivation for gaming. Academic debate takes students and puts them in a situation of discussing a scenario of national import, certainly not something most students spend large portions of their time doing. Fourth, freedom to experiment with ideas or situations may also increase motivation for gaming. Academic debate allows students an opportunity to experiment with their arguments.
positions and strategies in any way they wish. In fact, innovation in academic debate is often rewarded. Finally, there is a childlike characteristic within us all that loves to "play games." Academic debate, it seems, is one such game. The major reason for the motivation students gain through participation in the game of debate is provided by active participation. In most of the communication situations people find themselves in, a passive receiver is required for extended periods of time. In an academic debate, however, each person will have their say. Because they are involved in what is being said and will be participating later in the saying, participants have every motivation to pay attention. As Duke notes, when a game is a live experience motivation is an inevitable result.

2. RESOURCES

a. MONEY

"Games are one of the most expensive modes of communication," notes Duke. Even though the full expenditure necessary for gaming has not yet been documented. Considering the widespread misuse of many games,

200 Duke, p.81.
201 ibid.
the cost-benefit ratio might not be very high. Duke cautions that because of this cost factor, it is incumbent on the designer and the potential user to consider alternative modes carefully. Certainly, in academic debate we have seen this, with some programs turning to less expensive versions of the game, such as on-campus only debate and restrictions on the number of students allowed to participate, while others have dropped academic debate from their curricular and extra-curricular activities. As a long-time participant in academic debate and as a program administrator during that time, it does seem safe to say that academic debate activities will expand until all available resources are used up during any given season. Surely Duke's generalization about all games applies well to the game of debate.

b. TIME

Several kinds and amounts of time are necessary in order to engage in academic debate. These include but are not limited to: LEARNING TIME - time needed to learn about the game of debate, its theories, and how these apply; PREPARATION TIME - a considerable amount of time is needed in preparation for the discussion of a given scenario/topic prior to the debate itself; TRAVEL TIME - since tournaments and/or opponents are often many miles away from the homes of most participants, considerable travel is required, often by car, bus, or at times by plane.
3. SUBJECT

Every game has to be about something. In the case of academic debate the subject it deals with in any given season is the topic agreed to by national governing bodies. Usually these topics take the form of a "resolved" for the affirmative team to uphold and for the negative team to oppose. These scenarios are almost always presented as questions of policy, in that they direct some sort of action by a governmental body, although C.E.U.A. debate usually discussed questions of value as opposed to questions of policy. Basically, academic debate is what may be called a "frame game," where the game is the same but the information is merely loaded differently. In other words, the game of debate exists, and each year a new topic/scenario is fitted into it. Further discussion of the scenario will take place when scenarios are dealt with under the discussion of game components.

4. PARTICIPANTS

A game, to be played, needs participants. The major participants are debaters, judges, and coaches. Duke notes that participants in a game usually go through three stages of involvement. These stages seem to fit well with the genesis of many individuals involved in academic debate. (1.) The player is put off by the complexity and by the array
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of information being presented in the game; (2.) the player enters into a stage where he is in control of, or at least at ease with, the environment and during this time will explore with ingenuity a variety of options that come to mind within the context of the game, and (3.) the player develops a sophistication which exceeds the limits of the game and withdraws voluntarily from further participation, although not all participants reach this stage. These same three stages can also be seen in the involvement one has with academic debate. In the first stage, the debater is a "novice," and will probably compete in that category while he/she learns the ways of the game of debate. Often the novice is frustrated by the complexity and the vast array of possible issues raised within a given scenario. In the second stage, the debater has "learned the ropes," and proceeds to manipulate what he/she has learned about the game in such a way as to make the game as personally rewarding and as successful competitively as possible. Many debaters graduate from college and are no longer eligible to compete before this stage is completed. In the third stage, the debater has manipulated the portions of the game over and over again, and confronts the realization that, after all, this is "only a game," and turns to other pursuits. At any stage, however, debaters may and do drop out. It is useful, within the game design process, to be able to make projections such as these. For example, if a game is too simple it might satisfy participants at stage one, but will restrict the range of stage two and lead to stage three quite sooner. Also, if a game is too complex, a participant might be more likely to drop out in stage one. Academic debate can continue as long as it has participants, and it will
die when they are gone. It appears as if gaming can provide us with a framework for the analysis of the process of participation.

5. THE USE OF GAMES

Gaming is a methodology which can be utilized in a number of ways by those interested in it. Their application can be specific to various situations. These will be examined and related to academic debate.

a. ISOLATED, FREESTANDING GAMES

Games may be isolated, freestanding, disconnected events, and most commonly they are. In academic debate, however, the results of each individual game/debate are often tallied for tournament results, and even tournament results are tallied throughout the year. As well, academic debates have important continuity provided by a shared structure and a common year-long topic. Thus, this aspect of gaming would not apply to debate. Academic debate is very much like a game, and debates may be impromptu affairs and thus isolated and freestanding, but as currently practiced in the U.S., debate does not fit into this category.

b. PART OF ACADEMIC CURRICULUM

Debate is thought of in America as being an educational activity. It is linked to academia through its involvement with high schools,
colleges, and universities. As far as I am aware, there currently exists no non-academic arena within which debate as described here exists. Debate is seen as a direct-experiential learning technique by many departments of communication. Gaming serves as an outstanding educational tool, as was noted in chapter two and as will be explained in chapter five.

c. USED FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS

Often, within an academic setting, debates will be used for public relations purposes. There seem to be two such purposes. The first is public disclosure and reporting of the results of competitive debating events. If a team does well, then it is likely that they will have their results reported in the appropriate media outlets (school newspaper, public relations office, alumni newsletters, local newspapers, etc.) both to publicize the institution and its success as well as to highlight and publicize the debate program itself. The second use for a game is public display. Often debate teams will put on "exhibition debates" for the public or the students of a school. At times these may be intramural or at other times against another school. These debates often serve to educate persons about the debate process as well as serve some public service by discussing issues. With this in mind, a great deal of audience adaptation is utilized, and the debate usually slips into traditional paradigm.

c. USED BY CITIZENS IN DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC POLICY
Students and coaches involved in debate become concerned about the issues they discuss. After involvement with a question, participants tend to develop firm sets of beliefs. A student who has been involved in 75 two-hour debates on issues of national defense becomes a better citizen decision maker about those issues, as the vast information and complex systems involved in national defense are discovered. While few identify this as a major goal of debate, it certainly is a by-product. Those who have been involved in academic debate for a number of years have noticed how popular debate cases and positions often become the areas of discussion for society at large in later years. There may be two reasons for this. First, academic debate is largely made up of evidence and information from the general pool of available data about a scenario, thus it is not surprising that areas of concern to debaters and to real policymakers tend to match up. Second, those who are involved selecting the various topics/scenarios seem to strive for areas which are emerging public issues, as opposed to crises which have been with us for some time, though the latter has certainly not been the case with some choices from the past. This is not to say that concepts developed in debate rounds go on to sweep the nation, but such an outcome is possible and probably operates in steady, slow and far more subtle ways.

C. DEFINE THE GAME MESSAGE

If gaming is a communication activity, players and organizers may put some restrictions on what communications constitute part of the
game and which do not. A game message attempts to define a multi-
dimensional, simultaneous, systemic, complex, and interactive situation,
according to Duke. In academic debate, two forms of messages seem to
be important -- the message as acted out and the message contained in
flow charts.

1. MESSAGE AS ACTED OUT

Debaters act out a message during the debate round. Each team
gives four speeches and perhaps engages in cross examination periods.
The content of these speeches, verbal and visual, comprise the message
acted out in the debate itself.

2. THE USE OF FLOW CHARTS

The analysis of a complex system requires the simultaneous
consideration of a number of factors. An important technique for
achieving this is "flow charting." In the terminology of Duke the
completed flow chart is a blueprint of the actual game. Flow charting
represents a graphic presentation of the various elements of the
system, with linear pointers going from "box to box" to illustrate
flows, linkages, and impacts. Duke notes that the "purpose of a flow
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chart is to convey the imagery of an entire system." Few students of modern academic debate could deny this definition and its applicability to the flow charts used in debates to record and understand the debate.

The major limit implicit in flow charting within gaming is the requirement for sequential action. Flow charts are, according to Duke,

designed to permit the pulsing or the logic of a particular situation through the flowcharted structure so that one can follow in one's mind the path of logic that is expected to occur." Linkages between elements become explicit because they are graphically connected. Clearly, the debate activity is sequential (speeches follow each other and serve as "pulses of logic" within the system of the debate). The speeches are "flow charted" sequentially and then evaluated through an analysis of linkages made explicit through location and notation on the flow chart. One danger in the use of a flow chart noted by Duke is that it takes special skills to utilize one, and thus may turn the game into an "elitist" activity in which entry skills must be obtained. Certainly this comment has been echoed by many viewing their first debate -- "How do you keep track of all that?" -- and the fact that debate flowcharting is one of the first skills a novice debater must be
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taught. Flow charts are especially useful in examining future possible systems. As debate is recognized as a "frame game," Duke also sees flow charting as a "frame language." That is, within the relatively simple and straightforward system of flow charting, one may substitute a variety of subject matter with ease. Of course, the specific design of the flow chart may be changed as the character of the system is redesigned.

d. APPROPRIATE TEXT AND GRAPHICS

A number of texts about debate have been produced, and students interested in debate can consult them. However, they are often round to be in disagreement and also often become dated quickly. The "rules" within the game for the most part are determined by the players and the operators, and are often changed by agreement. Fortunately, there are no "holy scripts" of debate, so there is no set standard to hold back innovation. Unfortunately, this lack of standard texts leaves the novice debater in a situation where knowledge is difficult to accumulate except through experience.

e. ASCERTAIN APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF ABstraction

The level of abstraction chosen for a game is a very important
element. Obviously, if a game is too detailed, it will be too cumbersome, take too much time to play, and will cost too much. Duke suggests that the game may be evolved at differing levels of detail, and then the appropriate level may be taken from these alternatives. An additional problem involves which elements of detail to leave in and which to leave out. Duke's solution is oddly applicable. He suggests that these questions are "debatable" and that even while "arbitrary" decisions will be made on what to include and exclude, the debate process should yield the best results. Duke is specifically speaking of game designers here, and not participants. However, we should not conclude that this should be left primarily to the "designers" and not to the "participants" as well. As we will discover when we deal with rules, it seems desirable to leave as much detail to the participants' stipulation as possible.

2. GAME CONSTRUCTION

a. ORDER OF PROCESSING

A game requires an order for processing information. As we have seen, Duke refers to these as "puises or logic," and makes sequential communication a prerequisite for the use of flow charts. Of course, the order of processing communication in a debate is also sequential. As we
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have discussed, a debate is composed of two teams, an affirmative and a negative, each composed of two persons. The order of processing begins when it is determined that individuals from a certain school will actually be the affirmative in this round and that individuals from a certain school (it may be the same school, though not usually in organized competition) will be the negative. A room is assigned by the event arranger, and the two teams meet there with a designated and announced judge or panel of judges. Each team member shall speak twice, usually for a shorter period of time during the second speech. Following these speeches, the judge makes a decision to determine which team did the better job of debating, and renders a decision, which is either announced or kept undisclosed for some period of time. In either case, the ballot is conveyed to a central tabulation point and that particular game run is completed.

b. BUILD COMPONENTS

1. MODELS USED IN THE GAME
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Duke discusses the various models which are utilized within a game. These will be defined and briefly related to the game of debate. These three models are really the factors utilized in making the decision within a debate. Variations on these three models usually
determine the outcome of a debate.

a. ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS

An accounting system is a factual representation of some real-world process at an acceptable level of detail for use in the context of the gestalt of the game. In debate, these would be thought of as issues or quantity/quality and/or outcome/process. In their advocacy for or against the scenario/topic being debated, teams may claim that their positions lead to a better quantity/quality or a better outcome/process. An example would be an affirmative team who advocated national health insurance on the grounds that a number of lives are being lost now through inadequate access to medical care. A quality process example might be an affirmative team who advocated more public participation on a certain issue because current procedures denied democratic participation. This model describes the outcomes and processes stemming from a position on the scenario advocated by a team.

b. SIMULATIONS

While accounting systems deal with the actual, simulations deal with the possible. Duke notes that simulations "are theoretical speculations about the character of some complex process." Simulations are intended to "predict" and they are very useful in games which are frequently oriented toward the resolution of "what if" questions. In
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academic debate this model can be thought of as predictions. Based on knowledge of a given output and a given process, these speculations try to determine "what if" issues — such as, what if the scenario is affirmed, or disconfirmed? These models attempt to predict the possible impact of the scenario being discussed, and thus influence the accounting system. Disadvantages, as commonly utilized in academic debate, would be examples of simulations.

c. HEURISTICS

Heuristics are concepts which aid the participant in discovering through the game process. In this sense, heuristics in the gaming model of debate encompasses what we would currently call "theoretical" or "procedural" concerns. Such concerns involve issues such as burdens of proof or demonstration for particular positions in the debate, the fairness of a given interpretation of debate theory, or a choice of paradigms. In brief, this conception of heuristics in the game of debate is that it includes all issues about the conduct of the debate itself. This seems justified since it corresponds to the purpose of the debate. If one of the purposes of debate is to educate, then issues about the ability to maximize such discovery would be a heuristic concern.

2. DEFINE INPUTS/OUTPUTS

The inputs and outputs of the game of debate are relatively obvious.
Inputs include: the identity of the participants and the judge, the content of the speeches delivered by all parties to the debate, the flow charts used to record the debate, and the visual imagery of what takes place at the scene of the debate.

The outputs of the debate include: the decision of the judge in favor of one team or another, quality points, the flow charts produced during the round, a written and/or verbal reason for decision, and a set of results of all competitions if the scene is a tournament.

3. PUTTING THE GAME INTO USE

There are twin concerns -- the ethics of the game and the dissemination of the game. While both are important, ethics seems to be of a more urgent concern.

a. ETHICS

Ethics concerns codes of behavior, and specifically in the "ought to" or "should" sense of behavior. Duke notes that the ethics of game use is a very important issue. While an issue of importance would hopefully be dealt with by strict criteria in the game design process, this is not possible, since many ethical considerations cannot be
anticipated during the design process and must be dealt with during the play of the game itself. In attempting to compose an ethical code for the game of debate, the options are either to state a small number of criteria which lack precision or to produce a long list of criteria which restrict the options of the participant. Recognizing that ethical considerations probably must be dealt with inside a given debate situation, it seems appropriate to opt for the former course.

Since academic debate is centered within the communication discipline, guidance for establishing ethical standards may be grounded within this field. J. R. Wallace has examined the various ethics which apply to the teacher of speech and which are grounded within the public character of public utterance in a free society. These suggested ethical guidelines are presented by Wallace for application to the teaching of speech. It is my intention to demonstrate their relevance to the ethical standard of the game of debate. Wallace notes four such ethics: (1.) during the moment of utterance the communicator is the sole source of argument and information, and thus has an obligation to present this data in an accurate form; (2.) the facts and information presented should be done so in a fair manner and without distortion; (3.) the communicator should reveal the sources of the information used; and (4.) the communicator should respect diversity of argument and opinion. These four ethics seem to apply well to the game.
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of debate. The fourth ethic is important in that a debate could not take place without some regard for the positions of those on the opposite side of the scenario. The first, second and third ethics seem to have in common a notion of honesty, in that communications should be accurate, undistorted, and from a revealed source. These first three imply that the debater should honestly present his/her statements. Thus, the major ethical guideline for a debate should be some form of honesty, at least if we are to apply Wallace's ethics to academic debate. The fourth ethic, respect for the freedom of others to communicate, will be examined separately under a consideration of procedures for guiding player behavior.

In establishing guidelines for ethics in the game of debate, some lack of precision must be allowed. In other words, all matters coming under the aegis of these criteria may not be ethical matters, but that will have to be discussed within each debate. The only prescriptive standard of ethics in the game of debate should be HONESTY. It is hoped that academic debate is not a forum for lying. This does not mean that when the topic is "Resolved: that U.S. military spending should be increased," that only those believing this before the debate can be affirmative debaters. Certainly, persons in this position who are negative debaters would present the best case they could against their personal belief. Rather, it means that those involved should not knowingly deceive others involved. For example, falsified facts or falsified testimony should not be entered into the debate, debaters should not knowingly lie about what their colleagues or
what they themselves have said during the round, and those keeping time
should strive to be accurate and avoid giving additional time to a
speaker they favor.

One problem in applying the ethic of honesty is that it may be
thought of as assuming that there is a clear definition of truth. While
this is a difficulty, it seems that the line is easier to draw between
something which "might" be true and something which is "definitely"
raise. For example, describing America's nuclear deterrent as "not
strong enough" may or may not be true, but a statement to support such a
position which knowingly and falsely reported the number of missiles
would be definitely raise. As already noted, such determinations must
be made within a specific debate.

Some may see "honesty" as inadequate as a single ethical guideline.
This terseness or ethical guidance is advocated because if the ethic of
honesty can be achieved, other problems now seen as ethical will become
self-regulating. If debaters and judges are honest about their actions
and motives, the situational nature of ethical disputes can be called
into play. For example, a judge who is honest about the decision in the
round by saying "The affirmative gave me $10," will certainly find such
honest communication as the beginning of moves to stop such behavior.
If, however, such a pronouncement is tolerated this would be an
indication that such action was within the ethic of the community at
large, and thus permissible. Honesty is the precondition for other
ethics related concepts. My desire is to allow for an open forum for
discussion of ethics within gaming, not to determine what is or is not ethical. It seems to me that achievement of a basic ethic of HONESTY should allow this forum to exist. For example, if the situation in a debate round is honestly handled, then students can engage in other discussions, such as whether a given move meets a criteria of fairness.

One of the purposes discussed within the conceptual map for a game of debate was that it serves as a contest to determine who did the better job of debating. This standard assumes and implies fairness, but this fairness can only be discussed and decided in the debate if there is honest communication taking place. This situational approach to ethical concerns in academic debate will be elaborated in Chapter Five.

While the guideline of honesty seems broad, that is because the issue of ethics is a broad one and touches so many parts of the game of debate. Because ethics is so important, we would like it to be a cut and dried matter, but because it isn't so easy we must concentrate on its successful application. In determining the ethical or unethical nature of any occurrence within the game of debate, prescriptive action on ethical grounds should be limited.

1. DESIGNER-PARTICIPANT ETHICS

By "designer" in the gaming sense I mean "event arranger" in the way referred to in the conceptual map. Designer/participant ethics would include two elements. First, there should be an accurate exchange of information about the individuals involved and the event planned.
Event arrangers should not deceive potential attendees or an event about the opposition, facilities, audiences, or other attractions. The participants, on the other hand, should also convey information honestly about number of attendees, their experience levels, and their identities. Second, there should be an honest effort on the part of event arrangers and attendees to fulfill their obligations. Event arrangers should try and supply promised facilities, meals, etc., while attendees should try and fulfill their obligations, or showing up promptly to debate, following tournament rules, etc. In both these examples, it is an "honest" effort that is required, not a successful result.

2. JUDGE-PARTICIPANT ETHICS

After the round begins, the relationship between the judge and the participants is important. Two ethical considerations seem to enter into the judge/participant relationship. First, the participants have an ethical obligation to make an honest presentation of material. Participants should not present knowingly false information to the judge. Second, the judge has an obligation to the participants to explain the reason for decision after it has been made. This should include relevant issues for awarding the decision.

3. DESIGNER-JUDGE ETHICS

The event arranger and the judge form the administrative portion of
the game of debate. Three ethical considerations seem to play a part of their interaction. First, they must engage in an honest exchange about judge assignment. The event arranger, for example, should be honest with the judges about how they are being assigned (randomly, rated by judge ability, geography, etc.). Conversely, the judge should engage the event arranger concerning how he/she would best be assigned (for example, a judge may wish to avoid judging close friends for fear of not being able to make a completely honest decision). Second, the judge should provide to the event arranger information about the decision once it is made -- the correct win/loss designation, points, and reason for decision. Third, since the event arranger has assigned the judge to specific debates in good faith, the judge should make an attempt to judge the round honestly as an obligation to the event arranger.

4. PARTICIPANT-PARTICIPANT ETHICS

While the simplest of the ethical applications to describe, this set of ethics is perhaps the most important. Two considerations appear here. First, participants should convey to each other an honest description of their position on the topic under debate. Second, the participants should convey to one another as honestly as possible their understanding of the position of the other team on the topic under debate. Participants, in other words, have an obligation to exhibit their true level of understanding of the positions in the debate. While ethics is a very important part of the game of debate, it is very much like most of the rest of the activity -- it is a consideration to be