players share the use of the same language and that they have some practical math skills. It seems clear that for an academic debate to take place, some basic communication and logical skills must be shared by the contestants. In this case, standard use of English by students is assumed. Particular regionalisms are probably allowed, and possibly may be manipulated in order to set a tone or appeal to a given judge. One would have to say, however, that in the vast majority of academic debates the emphasis is on clear, concise, and terse use of the English language. Mathematical skills, as well, are shared. Competitors and judges utilize basic math skills, at least in determining the outcome of a round, and certainly share notation in terms of flowcharting. For example, with the paradigm of policy making, as was noted in chapter one, judges are urged to calculate the values and the probabilities of policy systems in order to render the decision. Advanced mathematical tasks, since they are not readily amenable to verbal expression, are seldom seen in a debate context, though evidence utilized by debaters may often refer to complex mathematical calculations carried out by the sources quoted.

The interaction of the implications of basic shared English and mathematical skills can easily lead us to other considerations. For example, we assume that players are rational. Rapoport has noted that it is assumed that each player is "individually rational," in the sense that his preference ordering of the outcomes is determined by the order of magnitudes of his associated payoffs. Further, or stresses Rapoport, a player is rational "in the sense that he assumes that every other
player is rational in the above sense." The practical implications of this assumption of rationality has been shown to be important. 
Harsanyi has examined the implications of this in a set of "rationality postulates" which are applicable in game theoretical situations.

In terms of basic math skills or participants, it is true that academic debate has increasingly become a forum for the discussion of methodologies of studies and the manipulation of data bases in the interests of decision making. Perhaps nowhere are the two dominant paradigms (policy making and hypothesis testing) as closely linked as they are in the discussion of methodologies in debate: the policy making process is considering the vital questions of research methodology in the interest of affirming or negating a hypothesis (for example, whether a specific federal program is beneficial).

One factor in the discussion of methodologies, however, is the fact that math is "talked about" rather than "demonstrated," since this is hard to do verbally. The result is that we engage in scientific speculation at times in an academic debate, but must forego the trappings of mathematical symbolism. In terms of game theory, Rapoport
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comments that this is far from regrettable. He notes a feeling of strong ambivalence with regard to the use of elaborate mathematical symbolism in a discussion of game theory. He notes "I have read innumerable papers in this genre and could not suppress the suspicion that the symbolism serves as window dressing to camouflage paucity or triviality of content."

b. SUPERSYMBOLS

When specialists in any field of study converse with one another, they often use a form of "jargon" with which the rest of us are unfamiliar. This is standard procedure, and not because they seek to confuse others, but because it is far more convenient. If one develops a statistical manipulation process called "daiiping," he/she might explain it to you at great length. Then, in our later discussions we could use the word each time we needed to without going back through the entire concept. These forms of referential symbolization can be likened to the creation of supersymbols.

Duke observes that the game model, when functioning during the event of a game, is the basis for a game specific language. The jargon employed to describe roles or components of reality which are modeled
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become the "supersymbols" (symbols which are unique to the game), while
the basic game structure, including the constraints of message potential
between teams as well as the behavior of individual teams in response to
the message, becomes the set of conventions governing the use of the
game specific symbols. "These two, in conjunction, constitute the game
specific language." In summary, games employ supersymbols, in the words
of Duke, carefully referenced to a conceptual map as a device for
conveying gestalt. The number of supersymbols employed is one useful
indicator of the nature of a given game. "The success of gaming is
largely derived from the careful and orderly encoding of information and
ideas in supersymbols."

Definition of supersymbols can be very important. Buchler and
Nutini observe that in gaming, as with most of the social sciences,
extreme care must be given to definitions. Two of the problems they
mention are the establishment of "minimum vocabularies" and the
construction of "coordinative definitions." In discussing minimum
vocabularies Buchler and Nutini advise the application of Occam's
Razor: "Entities are not to be multiplied unnecessarily." In other
words, while the vocabulary of a game is very important, it should be
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kept at a "minimum." If kept at a minimum, it will serve to enable
different persons to engage in the same classifications of primary data.
within each category of primary data, each individual might engage in
further individualized definitions, which will clarify without
disrupting the organizational scheme. The second element is the
creation of coordinative definitions. Here, Suchier and Nutini note
that coordinative definitions involve logical as well as epistemological
considerations. They note that coordinative definitions have been
developed "in order to bypass the problem of the bifurcation of nature
into the "immediately sensed" and the "postulated but not sensed" (that
is, nature as sensed, and nature as conceived by scientific theory)..."
in constructing a game of debate, there is a need for coordinative
definitions. Since debate takes place purely in the realm of symbols,
it would seem fruitless to discuss the differences between what is
really happening" and what is "happening in the debate only." Rather,
the two seem to come together -- what is really happening is what is
happening in the debate. One of the major problems of existing
paradigms is that they engage in false pretensions of real significance
-- they ask students and judges to make believe that they are "policy
makers" or "hypothesis testers," when in fact they are merely
participants in a game of debate. John Keany in teaching younger
debaters, confronts them with the fact that it is silly for them to
pretend they are congressmen or scientists and then waits for their
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reply. They often remark, "well, if we aren't supposed to be policy makers, how can this be real?" His response is very illustrative of this point: "You are real, your opponents are real, your arguments are real, this is a REAL DEBATE!" Perhaps one of the most cumbersome notions in academic debate today concerns what to do about the power or "flats," referring to questions of how, for the purpose of the debate, a given policy is adopted in the real world. Obviously, no policy is adopted in the real world, so why should we be concerned about it? This and many other thorny theoretical problems can be disposed of because the symbolic process in the debate is the real event. Through the use of coordinative definitions, the game of debate exposes various paradigmatic fantasies and puts students in the middle of a "real debate," a created reality within a gamed setting.

In the area of academic debate, a number of supersymbols exist — concepts and processes referred to, argued about, but not necessarily defined over and over again. Thus, a negative team can assert that an affirmative has no "significance" without necessarily explaining why this is important. The supersymbol "significance" is a shared concept. The affirmative has a "case," which has a "plan," and these promise to
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provide "advantages" or superior conditions to the "status quo" which somehow provides an "inherent" barrier to adopting this proposal. Super_symbols become points of conflict within the debate, and are thus closely aligned to the rule content of the game. Rules and procedures will thus influence the creation of agreed-on super_symbols, and that debate over the outcome of these super_symbols then takes place.

The specific super_symbols will be handled under the rules and procedures section below. However, super_symbols cannot be too descriptive. In the use of any symbol system in a game, the more involved, precise, and detailed the super_symbols are, the less broadly applicable they are and the more the game becomes involved, time consuming, and costly.

There are problems with the use of super_symbols in academic debate. Often teams debate each other with totally different definitions of these super_symbols in mind. Such vagueness and lack of understanding can severely deplete play. Duke suggests that a glossary is an essential item, as it should set forth the game specific language term by term. A glossary can also introduce new players to the degree of complexity involved in the game. While no attempt will be made at this time to provide such a glossary, it certainly would be an outstandingly
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useful teaching item. While some have been constructed for specific squad use, none have been widely circulated.

c. PARAPHERNALIA AND VISUAL AIDS

Most debaters find themselves in the unenviable position of Marley's ghost in Dickens' *A Christmas Carol*. Marley was punished for his love of material things by being forced to drag a large number of heavy chests around with him through eternity. While not condemned to quite so long a sentence, the modern debater finds him/herself weighted down with a large amount of "paraphernalia," in the form of a number of sample cases full of evidence cards, binders with prepared argument briefs, note paper, pens, water glasses, food, good luck charms, and the like. Often these belongings serve as visual aids, expressing in a non-verbal sense to the judge and the opponents that this team is "prepared," because they certainly have brought a large amount of material on the topic with them.

d. ROLES WITHIN THE GAME

228 Duke notes that in a game there are several types of roles:
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pseudo-roles, gamed-roles, and simulated-roles. These will be defined and related to the game of debate.

1. PSEUDO-ROLES

Pseudo-roles are not linked to the basic rule structure; they employ special participants with skills or special relevance to the system under discussion. Pseudo-role decisions are not processed formally through the game accounting models, but they may have a real impact on the game. These roles do not belong to players.

The game of debate equivalent to pseudo-roles would seem to be the roles played by coaches and associates not present during the actual game run. For example, in a debate the coach is not actually there, though the decisions made by the coach with the debaters before the round may have a very great impact on the game run itself. Likewise, associates who provide assistance or information before a specific debate would fit this category.

2. GAME-D-ROLES

Gamed-roles are personally present at the time of gaming activity and are required to interact with the other players and participants in some stated role, and are required to make decisions which are processed and returned.
In the game of debate, gamed-roles are played by the debaters themselves. For example, on a negative team different individuals fill the roles of "first negative" and "second negative." They are personally present during the round, they are required to interact in the debate, and they are required to make decisions about strategy which are then processed and returned by the judge.

3. SIMULATED-ROLES

Simulated-roles are not represented by a player, but are represented in the mechanics of the game through judge utilization. They are used to generate output useful to gamed- or pseudo-roles.

In the game of debate, simulated-roles are often played by paradigms introduced into the round by the debaters. In calling for evaluation of their gamed-roles, debaters will invoke such phrases as "the rational policy maker would," thus calling up a simulated role which they hope will be used in evaluation of their gamed-roles. This is where the current paradigms belong within the game of debate. The problems I have discussed appear when one attempts to utilize a given paradigm as an overarching theory for academic debate, not when they are used as simulated-roles.

4. THE RULE OF THREE

Social interaction and game effectiveness are maximized by the
sharing of roles. Duke has argued that a game is most effective if it adopts a "rule of three." While players may be organized in any number of ways, the rule of three argues that single person decision making should be used sparingly. Preferably, three participants should play the role of an individual. Duke observes that "the three individuals playing the role of an individual may be considered a team." Player organization, if it follows the rule of three, can heavily influence the success of a game for gestalt communication purposes.

Academic debate obviously has discovered its own variant of the rule of three. In a debate round, the roles are affirmative, negative, and judge, thus each round utilizes the rule of three. Within the structure of each team, three roles go into making the entire team. An individual debater occupies one position on each side, the other debater occupies the other position, and the coach occupies a third position. Even though there might be more than one coach, there is still only one role defined as "coach" which could be filled in a number of ways. It seems worthy of consideration that much of the success and intellectual challenge perceived by some in academic debate has come from this rule of three (for example, many participants in the game of debate have found the three way interaction of coach/team to be extremely rewarding), and consideration of its implications on the future of academic debate should be increased. As well, panels of
judges are often assembled in threes.

2. GAME PROCEDURES

a. RULES OR PROCEDURES?

One wonders how academic debate has survived this long without a comprehensive set of rules. However, on further examination this is not surprising at all. In fact, as Duke has observed, "...most, if not all, Games represent a "happening" rather than the product of deliberate design process." As we shall see, strict rule structures are counterproductive and should be avoided.

What is meant by the concept of rule? Atkins and Curtis note that rules of every sort share at least one common property: "they all may be said to RULE IN something or other, while RULING OUT something else." In their opinion, ruling and ruling out is what rules at a minimum do and are at a minimum for, whatever else may be said of them.

At this point, a group of rules can be generated for the game or debate. As rules, they are the structural foundation for the game, and

230
Duke, p. 73.

231
are probably not open to manipulation and redefinition during the debate round. As such, rules are to be differentiated from procedures by their immutability.

There seem to be three groupings of rules for the game of debate. First, the resolution itself has a precise wording. Teams are aware of the wording of the resolution before the debate begins. Disputes may arise over the interpretation of the resolution, but its precise wording is not open to challenge and dispute. Second, timing of the debate is established as a rule. Each team is given a set number of speeches with set time lengths. These temporal constraints, as well as constraints on preparation time, are set before the round, known to both teams and the judge, and are not open for discussion. For example, a last affirmative rebuttalist could not argue successfully that he/she should be given an extra minute to speak, even in a tabula rasa paradigm. Third, the identity of the various parties is an established rule before the debate begins. Students are identified as being from a specific school and are identified as affirmative or negative. As well, the identity of the judge has been established before the round. This is not open to dispute. For example, during a round, a team might not argue that actually the pairings are in error and they should be on the other side of the resolution.

Many persons conceive of codes of behavior in games as immutable and sacrosanct. While this may be true in some contexts, it should not be true of gaming. Duke believes that there has been an undue emphasis
on rules in gaming. A much more rewarding concept might be that of "procedures," intended as a flexible term to cover all mechanics of play. "Because the game is viewed as an "environment for learning," it is essential that players be able to interact with the game, often in ways not initially perceived by the designer. In so doing, they may feel it necessary to change the structure of the game." Certainly some procedures should not be altered (Duke indicates that the cycles and sequences of communication may not be changed), but for the most part procedures should be open to change by participants. As Duke concludes, "...if the players are permitted or encouraged to alter, amend, or enrich procedures within the basic gaming structure, we can maximize learning without the laborious and unnecessary specification of an elaborate rule structure." An example of this as evident in modern debate is the notion of whether "topicality," (the issue of whether the affirmative team actually advocates the Topic/scenario for the debate) is a "rule" of the game of debate. While most judges would say it is, they nevertheless listen to and evaluate positions put forth by various teams that this is not a hard and fast rule. Future's Languages, of which gaming is a big part, are a dynamic communication form; they must respond to changing perceptions during use.

Duke notes that the most successful and well designed games are often very changeable.
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They permit the restructuring or redefinition of the game itself during the event of play. The more thoughtful games deliberately structure mechanisms which encourage and facilitate player or operator-modification during the event of play.

Thus, besides the three rules of debate, regulators of play should be thought of as "procedures," that can be changed during the event as argued by the participants, and should be kept to a minimum.

One overall guide which should apply to procedures is that they should involve an equal opportunity for both teams in the debate. In the conception of debate as an educational contest, we should attempt to keep it "fair" to both sides involved, since one of the purposes of debate is to see who did the better job of debating. For example, if one team argues that the procedures should be adjusted so that the other team is only allowed to speak half as long as they are, this would be perceived as violating a basic premise of equal opportunity. Since the game of debate has two sides, we should keep the opportunity for either team to gain the decision as equal as possible.

In summary, then, the procedures which are about to be presented try to balance the criteria just discussed. While striving for equal opportunity, these procedures try not to be too prescriptive and are even open to modification during the game run.
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Buchner and Nutini point out that rules/procedures can take two forms: ground rules and strategy rules. Duke notes that there are procedures linked to the models used in the game and procedures linked to player behavior. Thus, the following two groups of procedures emerge.

1. PROCEDURES RELATED TO MODELS

The models used in the actual play of the debate are accounting systems, simulations, and neuristics. In dealing with procedures relating to these models, it seems obvious that what we are trying to answer is the question, "What does it mean to do the better job of debating?" In an attempt to answer this, the following are proposed.

1. A team should support their side of the scenario/topic. The debate takes place over a national or specifically pre-determined resolution. Teams are designated as either affirmative (supporting the scenario) or negative (opposed to the scenario). Once a team has been assigned to a side, they must defend that side in a given game run. This encompasses the supersymbol of TOPICALITY, the argument or one team that the other has not defended their designated side of the
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scenario/topic. 2. A team should indicate during the debate that their side or the scenario/topic is preferable. The debate is a contest between two teams, and they strive to indicate to the judge that the side they have been assigned to is indeed the preferable position on this issue. This process involves four elements: A. Statements specifying their position. Since the scenario itself is vague, each team must develop a position under the scenario which they will contrast with the position of the opposing team. Each team is obligated to present a position in the debate. Various supersymbols encompassed here include: PLAN, the position under the scenario advocated by the affirmative; COUNTERPLAN, the position not under the scenario advocated by the negative team which involves additional action; and STATUS quo, the position not under the scenario advocated by the negative team which needs no additional action. B. Statements illustrating the viability of their position. Beyond merely specifying a position, a team is obliged to explain why that position operates as it does. It is assumed that teams are familiar with and can explain a position they advocate. This encompasses the supersymbols of SOLVENCY and WORKABILITY. C. Statements should provide reasons why their position is best. Advocacy of a certain position should be for a reason. Teams here are expected to be able to show that the outcome or process of their position is superior in quantity and quality to the position of the opposition. In order to compare, specific elements must be presented for comparison. This encompasses the supersymbols of SIGNIFICANCE, HARM and ADVANTAGE. D. Statements should address the major objections the other team may have against their position. While each team is expected to build a
position, they are also expected to deal with the major objections the opposing team may launch against their position. As well, teams are expected to have major objections to the position of the other team. This encompasses the supersymbols of DISADVANTAGES and SOLVENCY.

3. A team should defend their heuristic view of the debate itself. In discussing the admissibility, jurisdiction, or requirements of a given action by a team, heuristics will come into play. Teams may argue about the nature of the debate process itself in determining how models should be evaluated. This encompasses such supersymbols as can be found in THEORY ARGUMENTS, such as BURDENS OF PROOF, PARADIGMS and DECISION RULES.

2. PROCEDURES RELATED TO PLAYER BEHAVIOR

A second theory of procedures is that concerning player behavior. This general area, according to Duke, is much less rigid than rules dealing with accounting systems. "They will tend to have a degree of latitude either specified or permitted by the operator." Often these procedures govern the step by step routines of the game. Duke writes that in almost all games it is necessary to have procedures governing tasks associated with the routine play of the game. "The failure to
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have such rules results in a chaotic situation and the players will be uncertain about the ground rules." In identifying procedures related to player behavior, a second list is drawn up as follows. 1. Teams should respect the freedom of other participants and the judge to communicate. Players and judges gather in academic debates to engage in a communication process. In order for this process to be successful, all must have an opportunity to communicate. Wallace has stated in the earlier section on ethics that a communicator should respect diversity of argument and opinion. Within this concept, debaters should respect the freedom of others to communicate. Since one of the purposes of the game of debate is to communicate about the scenario/topic, this is an important procedure. 2. Teams should engage in ethical behavior. As explained under the section on ethics, this is an important procedural consideration. Loosely, ethical behavior can be thought of as "honest" behavior. A number of specific ethical obligations have already been identified.

D. MECHANICS OF GAME PLAY

1. GAME PHASES

Each game takes place in steps. Sequential communication, as we have seen, is a part of gaming. As well, games have an iterative nature to them which is extremely important. Duke notes that the various
steps or play are extremely important to gaming. "Games are iterative, meaning that cycle follows cycle and that happenings within a given cycle repeat and reinforce those which have preceded it. The success of games in conveying gestalt is largely derived from their iterative nature."

In academic debate each game run is only part of a greater pattern. In a tournament, each round is followed by another round until a given number of preliminary rounds is complete. In a year of academic debate, round follows round, and tournament follows tournament. Each game run is different than the last, yet each game run has important similarities to all previous game runs. Players may understand the game and the scenario in more detail and with a more systemic outlook each time they participate in a game run.

The game of debate takes a complex scenario and allows students to run through this scenario over and over again in an attempt to communicate gestalt.

2. MACRO-CYCLE

In gaming, macro-cycle refers to "a complete run through all...game phases," according to Duke. This refers to the complete cycle of
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gaming -- from the introduction of a player to the game until the player breaks off contact with the game. The macro-cycle can be broken down into the following components.

a. INTRODUCTION TO THE GAME

During this phase of the macro-cycle, the novice players must learn about the game. Specifically, they must learn about the procedures of the game, the supersymbols involved, the game techniques, and their expected roles. As well, novice players must be introduced to the specific scenario to be debated, and it is assumed that they will need some time to familiarize themselves with it and gather various sorts of reference materials. After a novice player has been introduced to the game and the scenario, the next step in the macro-cycle is reached.

b. PLAY OF THE GAME

1. LEARNING BY DOING

Obviously, before a novice player is put into an actual game situation, trial runs are advisable. As such, various practice debates (against other novices or mock opponents) should be arranged. Several iterations of the game run should prove useful to acquainting the novice player with the game and the scenario through actual experience. Thus, when an actual game run is initiated against opponents, some familiarity will already have been developed. During these practice debates, the
role of the coach/judge is vital, in that students need to be advised after each presentation of what they did right and what they did wrong. Though usually a coach and/or a judge does not communicate with the players during a debate, it is vital during the practice debates that feedback be extensive and immediate.

2. DEALING WITH THE MESSAGE OF THE GAME

This is the actual game run, the competitive debate situation itself. In this phase of the macro-cycle, students actually participate in live game runs. They engage in single dentes or participate in tournaments as called for.

3. EVALUATION

At the conclusion of the macro-cycle, students have finished their active participation in game runs either for good or for that season. At this point, evaluation is essential. Students should evaluate not only their own progress at playing the game of debate, but should also evaluate the game itself in order to determine what revisions need to be made.

c. SCENARIO: THE TOPIC OF THE GAME

In our discussions of academic debate, the terms “scenario” (originating in the language of gaming) and “topic” (originating in
academic debate) have been used somewhat interchangeably. This section attempts to explain this substitution.

Most games have a fixed subject or scenario. Academic debate, however, has a subject which changes each year (though it often repeats itself) and is usually different for high school and college debaters. Duke has called this a "frame game." A frame game, he explains, is meant to be subject-less. It is "intended to be loaded with a subject by the operator (and/or participants) at the time of play." Thus, debate remains from year to year, but the subject is loaded differently.

Game design considerations demand specification of a scenario for the game and a subject for the game. The subject of a game, for example, should be specified in the most precise way, or else the final product may not be relevant to a particular purpose. In academic debate, the subject is the topic under debate which has been loaded into the debate frame game. Duke has observed that no single failure in game design is more common than an inappropriate use of scenario. Indeed, debaters and judges can easily recall problems with strangely worded topics and the arguments about the construction and nature of topics which have been used in debate rounds. However, most of the blame has been assigned to those constructing the topics. While in
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formal game design inappropriate use or scenario may be traced to a designer's lack of a clear purpose, it can also be traced to the "operator's insensitive use of the game," meaning that the debaters are at fault as well. The subject of the game is a vitally shared understanding for players. It is difficult for play to continue fully without some agreement on this account. Thus, topicality is an important issue in academic debate and is justifiably a voting issue and prior consideration in decision making in the debate round. While comparisons of topicality to jurisdiction in a legal setting, assignment to committee in a legislative setting, and a number of other analogies have been made, it is gaming which provides us with a clear understanding of why topicality is an important issue. Play must commence with a common agreement on the subject of the game. The importance of the scenario/topicality issue must not be overstated, however. We need to remember that the purpose of academic debate is also to educate students as well, and trade offs between education and the discussion of a given scenario must be recognized. Combs has observed that when we attempt to deal with problem solving in education, almost any subject can provide an effective vehicle for learning and the criterion for selection "will be in very large part whatever turns students on. The interest and commitment of students will become more important than the topics confronted." Thus, while the scenario is an important concern, it should not be the ONLY concern.
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C. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter the game design process and game components specified by Duke have been applied to academic debate. Utilizing the steps of his game design process, gaming terms and functions have been intertwined with those of academic debate. It would seem appropriate at this time to identify the task of this chapter as an initial exploration rather than as a fully-developed theory of debate as a "game." This has been an attempt to begin, not to conclude.

This specification has involved a considerable amount of effort, and a translation of academic debate into a gaming format will be a difficult task if undertaken by a large number of those involved in the activity. The question is, why would we want to do all of this? This question is hopefully answered in the next chapter, dealing with the values of academic debate being developed within a gaming paradigm.
CHAPTER FOUR
GAMING, THE "OLD" DEBATE AND THE "NEW" DEBATE

while somewhat uncomfortable with the terms "new" and "old" in reference to academic debate, the terms nevertheless stress an important point I am trying to make: we are in a paradigmatic crisis because our current models for academic debate no longer apply, while debate itself is quickly evolving into a "game" whether we like it or not. While most of those involved in debate have transcended the traditional paradigm, they now find themselves confronting academic debate with concepts from various paradigms, which we have already discussed. What is needed is a paradigm which has sufficient explanatory powers for the debate process and is comprehensive in its coverage of debate concerns. This, of course, is the purpose of this work.

What is meant by the "old" debate is an activity governed either by the traditional paradigm or by some combination of other paradigms without any overarching theory to broadly apply as a paradigm and/or serve as a uniting principle for the paradigms. Thus the "old" debate is what the authors of the various paradigms continue to argue about. The "old" debate is what many of the judging philosophy statements featured at the National Debate Tournament are about. The "old" debate is an unproductive attempt to stretch already over-extended metaphors to explain and serve as models for small portions of the academic debate experience. The "old" debate is not, however, what you hear in the majority of debate rounds.
The "new" debate is one which I am describing, some way to bring disparate paradigms together while providing a comprehensive and broadly applicable model for academic debate. While this is an attempt to outline a "new" debate, it is certainly not true that any debate theoretician has authored it. In most theoretical respects, and in many aspects related to academic debate, the students are far in front of the teachers. While respected forensic intellects argue about appropriate paradigms, debaters don't waste their valuable time on such pursuits. They use whatever paradigm they need in a given situation in order to get the job done. They clearly already see debate as a "game," and in an attempt to win that game students already use whatever strategies they think will work. It is judges who are more committed to the application of paradigms. The students will utilize whatever paradigm they feel they need for a specific situation and a specific judge, because they know it's all a game and they need to make the proper play in order to win. The "new" debate recognizes the inherent nature of gaming which is found in academic debate. It recognizes that paradigms need to be subsumed and sorted out as opposed to being regarded as mutually exclusive.

In my simplified taxonomy, the "old" debate can be thought of as the debate which we have been theorizing about in regards to the existent paradigms. The "old" debate envisions debate rounds as bouts of hypothesis-testing or of policy-making. The "old" debate is our existing paradigms. The "new" debate is a thing that has already emerged, and without guidance from any theoretician. The "new" debate
is what one actually sees in a debate round, students using the various paradigms as ploys within a game setting to win the game. The "old" debate can be thought of as our current set of "theories" about debate, while the "new" debate can be thought of as the "practices" which students and judges actually engage in. My contention is that these issues of theory and practice need to be united. Specifically, the contention is that gaming can serve as a viable "theory" which will fit the "practice" satisfactorily.

This work is, therefore, an attempt to explain a revolution in debate which has already taken place. Academic debate has become a game and it is time that we recognized it. Herein lies the appeal of the gaming concept. Academic debate has become a game without a seminal document or major theoretical figure. We might assume that this is a sign that the revolution is, in fact, real. In relating to authors who purport to develop new and "revolutionary" paradigms, Karabel and Halsey compare this to the paradigmatic analysis of Kuhn. In relation to educational methods, they assert that a careful reader of Kuhn would notice that one of the distinctive features of a true scientific revolution is its invisibility. "When the transformation of discipline is announced BEFORE the event, there is reason to suspect that one is witnessing not a scientific revolution but a more familiar phenomenon— an attempt by an emergent school of thought to legitimate its approach."

It is not my contention that the change in debate will follow upon the reading of this work. Rather, my claim is that the transformation to a gaming state is already well underway all around us. Our need is to recognize it and discuss its implications. This is what I will attempt to do in this chapter.

A. GAMING AS A MERGER OF THE "OLD" AND THE "NEW"

None of the paradigms should be rejected entirely. Every single paradigm discussed in chapter one has some useful concepts. The view of academic debate as a game actually serves to subsume these various paradigms. Specifically, it seems clear that paradigms as we normally use the term in academic debate today are most usefully thought of as "simulated roles" which are described in chapter three. As simulated role, they fit well with gaming.

1. THE TRADITIONAL PARADIGM IS CONSISTENT WITH GAMING

If we review the major tenets of the traditional paradigm, it seems obvious that gaming recognizes them. The first tenet of the traditional paradigm is that debate is a place to practice the skills of debating which will be useful for society. Certainly a gaming approach does not change this. Debate still represents a valuable educational opportunity for students to develop specific intellectual and presentational skills. The skills themselves may be somewhat different than they were many years ago, but that is to be expected.
The second tenet of the traditional paradigm is that debate is responsive to the needs of society. In this regard, gaming provides a powerful new tool to train citizens in new and special skills which they will need in the future and probably need now. In chapter two specific advantages to communication within a gaming framework were discussed. For example, gaming is an extremely useful communication mode for dealing with complex systems and information overload, and surely these are just two things that society definitely needs to teach to its members. Gaming matches up well with the traditional paradigm because it is an outstanding educational tool, as we shall discuss in chapter five.

2. GAMING AS POLICY MAKING

Policy making shares most of its major features with the game of debate spelled out in chapter three. Policy making is perhaps the most popular of the existent paradigms, so the fact that it shares so much in common with the game of debate should aid in the acceptance of gaming concepts.

The first tenet of policy making is that the debate is a place to discuss policy issues. While this is not strictly true of the game of debate which operates as a frame game and probably can be loaded with whatever subject matter is at hand, the resolutions utilized in most debates are resolutions of policy. By this it is meant that the resolutions/scenarios debated are pertinent to action.
primarily the COLLECTIVE action of humans, such as in a governmental
program. In this regard, gaming can, as has been explained, serve the
interests of policy making while exploring questions of policy.

The problem with policy making as a paradigm is that it does not
leave room for debates which might take place over propositions of fact
and propositions of value. For example, many colleges and universities
are switching to what is popularly known as "C.E.D.A." debate, and
available evidence is that this trend will continue into the 1980s.
While the acronym stands for "cross examination debate association," its
primary difference with normal competitive debate is that it utilizes a
proposition of value and a view of the judge as a common citizen without
specialized knowledge. Gaming as a paradigm allows for both of these
forms of debate, and handles both equally well, while policy making is
restricted only to debates over policy issues.

The second tenet of policy making is that we should take a systemic
perspective of the debate process. Gaming provides a superior
understanding and exploration of systems interaction. The whole of the
game process, as was illustrated through reference to Duke, is designed
to aid students in exploring a concept system through interaction with
it during a number of iterations. Policy making and gaming are quite
compatible here.
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Another tenet of policy making is that it trains students in democratic participation. Gaming also strives for this goal. As mentioned in chapter two, gaming is a viable methodology for demonstrating to citizens that they can influence decision making even on complex and technical issues.

The final tenet of policy making to be explored here is that the policy systems should be viewed as competing. Policy makers believe that each side gets to choose one policy and then the debate compares them. The game perspective of debate is much the same. In procedures, Group One, each team is required to specify their position (1-8-1) so that it can be contrasted with that of the other team. The game will be more rewarding if the options or each team are kept to ONE policy. This, of course, disagrees with the position of hypothesis testing, which will be dealt with shortly. At that point it will be clear that the game of debate discussed here specifies one position for each team, but also recognizes that the procedures (even as they are laid out in chapter three) are certainly open to question within the debate.

Gaming is an often used methodology by those involved in policy making, with war gaming and international relationship gaming being just two examples. The two concepts mean together very well.

3. GAMING AND HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Gaming is a methodology which is not inconsistent with hypothesis
testing as well. In previous pages the value of gaming and game theory to scientific research has been documented. Within the area of academic debate the two have a considerable amount in common as well.

The first tenet of hypothesis testing is that it sees the debate as a scientific search for probable truth. Gaming, as a methodology, is not mutually exclusive with this notion. It seems clear that gaming, if manipulated properly, can definitely be a scientific tool, in that it can be used to validate or invalidate given positions. For example, Kanan and Amnon Rapoport have used gaming to test bargaining models and hypotheses about bargaining behavior. A debate is clearly an important part of the testing that a scientist utilizes, whether it is a debate going on inside the individual's head or whether it involves a number of colleagues who are jointly trying to determine the results of a given experiment. If hypothesis testers see themselves as determining probable truth, though, they are probably engaging in the use of an oxymoron. An oxymoron is a phrase or cliche which contains an internal contradiction. In *Permanence and Change* Kenneth Burke calls upon the examples of such perspectives by incongruity as "a brightness wholly black," and a "bitterness, intensely sweet." This is the context

---


within which I view "probable truth." While on the one hand this seems to be a total contradiction, it is also a useful insight, because the notion of "probable truth" educates us to the fact that we cannot know "absolute truth." With the adoption of the notion of probability in truth, it seems plausible to argue that in each debate the arguments and presentations with the "most probable truth" win the ballot. From a gaming perspective, each iteration of the game cycle reveal more and more of the truth of the system it deals with.

A second tenet of hypothesis testing is that the resolution is tested against all other possible systems. This position allows the negative to offer any number of positions to test against the one affirmative position represented by the resolution. While I certainly do not necessarily agree with the desirability of the situations implied here, and while I do suggest that the debate be a comparison of two teams with two different positions, I do not rule out the multiple positioning which hypothesis testing calls for. As I have mentioned earlier, this is the type of procedure which should be decided within the debate itself. This issue has split hypothesis testing from the other paradigms. Gaming, through its view of flexible procedures, recognizes the legitimate interests of both positions. Hypothesis testing and policy making can, within gaming, continue to wage battle over which would be the superior simulated role for the game.

4. Gaming and Tabla Rasa
The tabula rasa paradigm is more a set of guidelines for judges than it is a paradigm. It argues that judges should be open-minded and attempt to evaluate positions taken by debaters. Certainly, gaming would agree with this role for the judge. The tenets of tabula rasa mentioned earlier are: let the debate happen; let the debaters decide; avoid internal judgements; and leave theory questions open to question. Gaming easily matches up with all of these, especially with the last tenet by realizing that procedures need to be flexible. The game of debate, however, realizes that fairness and objectivity are goals, and are not totally achievable. Tabula rasa fails as a paradigm for academic debate, but operates well as a set of guidelines for judges.

5. Gaming as an Exploration of Stock Issues

Through the concept of supersymbols the stock issues perspective finds itself well represented within gaming. As we have mentioned supersymbols are a form of game specific language where an entire concept is given a simple symbolic designation so that the concept can be manipulated with more ease and precision. These supersymbols are, oddly enough, the stock issues which the proponents of this perspective have isolated. The game also recognizes that the stock issues will be added and subtracted from as the scenarios change. Both perspectives also recognize that the issues in a debate may interact in many different ways.

Of all of the “old” paradigms, the stock issues perspective is
probably the most appealing. My primary concerns have been with unifying and subsuming the various paradigms, and in a similar pursuit the stock issues perspective also makes considerable progress. The stock issues are, as Gass has stated in chapter one, what the various paradigms have in common. While most objections to this perspective as an outright paradigm persist, it is important to recognize the unifying function that stock issues can serve, and it is well that they fit so closely with the gaming concept of supersymbols.

6. GAMING AND THE CRITIC OF ARGUMENT

Much like the tabula rasa paradigm, the critic of argument paradigm calls for the judge to assume a given role. As with tabula rasa, it is difficult not to agree with the role that the judge is asked to occupy. Certainly, there is substantial room for coexistence here. The problems with this paradigm, as we have seen, are that it fails to comprehensively cover very much of the debate.

As we have seen, the tenets of the critic of argument approach are that the judge should act as a critic, that the judge should draw from the field of argument, and that the judge should draw from the field of the topic. Within gaming, the judge should certainly operate as a critic of the debate in the sense of evaluating performance, but certainly not in the sense of telling debaters what they "should have done." The critic in this paradigm is the same as the judge in the gaming paradigm. Obviously, the judge will have to draw from the field
of argument to determine the competing logical power of the arguments and positions presented. As well, the critic should be aware of how the information is loaded into the frame game, as the scenario of a given game greatly influences its content.

Thus, a judge in the game of debate might perceive of him/herself as a critic of argument, though the judge should certainly be more than that as well, and it seems unlikely that advocates of the critic or argument position would find this proviso of additional roles as objectionable.

B. DOES GAMING AVOID THE PITFALLS OF THE OTHER PARADIGMS?

In chapter one, a number of general indictments are made of the six available paradigms. In order for gaming to be a viable mechanism to subsume the paradigms, these charges should be related to gaming.

1. DOES GAMING FRACTIONALIZE VIEWS OF DYNAMIC PROCESSES?

The argument against the paradigms is that each concerns itself with part of the debate system. Some paradigms examine the role of the judge closely, some examine the role or the resolution closely, still others examine points of stasis which emerge in the debate round. We have also seen how gaming easily subsumes these paradigms. Thus, gaming provides an overall view of the dynamic system of debate without demanding that we reject any of these useful tools. As was explained in
chapter two, gaming is one of the most powerful educational methodologies available for teaching gestalt. "Gaming stresses dynamic change and systemic analysis. It asks students to look at whole events, and tries to minimize paradigmatic tunnel vision."

2. DOES GAMING HAVE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE PRETENSIONS OF REAL SIGNIFICANCE?

247 Avedon and Sutton-Smith have observed that on a phenomenological level the experience of humans playing games is quite real. The player experiences a sense of being possessed. "He is under the control of forces that at rare times he can scarcely control, yet as we know the pretense quality of the game means that he can control them. Their vividness is only of the players own making and could only occur because these (games) are, in effect, voluntary control exercises."

While most of the paradigms ask the debaters and/or judges to play certain "parts" in an example of "play acting," they provide no suitable structure within which these activities are appropriate. Gaming does. Gaming recognizes that the event is not a "real" debate for the purposes of deciding government policy, it nevertheless is a "real" game about an important question or government policy. The game of debate is a REAL event, complete with considerable drama inherent to the game itself.

Students commit themselves to the playing of the game totally, with all of their intellects and energies. It is difficult not to think of this as a real event. Gaming admits to role playing and suspension of disbelief that is necessary upon entering the game. No other paradigm, within itself, recognizes this.

3. DOES GAMING REDUCE THE DISCUSSION OF SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES?

Yes and no, but that depends on how you define "substantive" issue. The realm of theory argumentation within the "old" debate is a complex field. There are not any clear criteria currently existent for evaluating theory issues. Gaming addresses this problem. Through a requirement that each team be willing to defend heuristic issues, they must defend their notion of the debate and show how it is a "guide to discovery." The possibility of amending and changing rules and procedures is recognized, but it is guided by criteria drawn from the conceptual map (specifically, the purposes of the game of debate) and the equal opportunity criteria advanced in the section on procedures. Thus, debate theory is recognized as a body of knowledge defensible as a guide to discovery through debate, in achievement of the purposes of debate and through the procedures allowable by a criteria of equal opportunity.

In actuality, debate has already reached this point. Many judges
have expressed their willingness to adapt to theory arguments. The problem has been in actualizing this willingness to adapt through the proper presentation of theory arguments. Zareisky and Mincoberg claim that while many judges say they are open to theory arguments, they have not shown themselves to be in consideration of hypothesis testing and justification arguments. The response should be that theory arguments have not, as yet, had any unifying framework through which they can be evaluated. Gaming seems to provide such a framework.

4. DOES GAMING BLOCK DEBATE OFF FROM OTHER DISCIPLINES?

Many of the paradigms attempt to identify debate with certain disciplines —— with science, argumentation, politics, or persuasion. Gaming, however, is a method which can be applied in many disciplines with different disciplines utilizing the same method, interdisciplinary work is easier. Political simulation and game construction scholar Stuart Bremer notes that scholars from other disciplines should see the need for more inter-disciplinary work and the value of cross-fertilization. The problems of the globe require a concerted (joint)
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This potential for drawing knowledge from many disciplines together is one of the most inviting features of gaming as an approach to academic debate. There are many indications that academic debate is a trans-disciplinary activity, yet we have been unable to locate theoretical structures which coincided with this particular feature. Gaming, a technique widely used in a large number of fields, directly approaches this concern and provides a methodology through which academic debate can speak to other disciplines and vice versa.

An example of how gaming has brought different disciplines together is explained by Buchter and Nutini. They note that game theory makes it possible to bring the fields of sociology and psychology closer together. First, the ground rules level of gaming seems to be primarily sociological (it has to do with consensual action), while the strategy-rule or stochastic level is to a considerable extent psychological. Second, "since it is assumed that these two levels cannot be separated, the thresholds where sociology and psychology become causally efficient must be regarded as strategic areas of conceptualization." when we examined the ways in which gaming subsumed
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the various paradigms it was through much the same process. First, it
was realized that the various paradigms ALL had some important points to
make. Second, it was realized that it is the interaction between these
various components which is crucial for our examination. Thus, in the
same way, gaming should bring together paradigms and the other
disciplines they represent.

Some aspects of the "new" debate seem to be indicating just such an
interface. Williams observes that the 1980s may well be a time in
which there is more of a unity developed between debate theory and
debate rounds, eventually with the concepts and tools used in debate
rounds being expanded into other disciplines. Hynes sees a similar
process taking place. With the pressure to publish on directors of
debate growing, and with continued resistance within the speech
discipline to debate related articles, debate scholars will most likely
turn to other disciplines as publication outlets, or perhaps even turn
to popular current events publications in order to gain the publications
needed for tenure. Gaming thus serves as an interdisciplinary
methodology.
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5. DOES GAMING EXPLAIN THE COMPETITIVE FORMAT OF DEBATE?

A serious charge against the paradigms is that they do not recognize the competitive elements which are so pervasive in debate. Students are engaged in competitions where they win and lose. This is the overriding reality of any debate tournament and any debate with a decision. While the critic of argument perspective and the tabula rasa perspective recognize the contest element of debate, they do not explain or account for it.

Gaming assumes competition at the outset. The game of debate is recognized as a competitive setting within the conceptual map. Within the notions of game design, player involvement, and competitiveness are manipulated so as to better meet the purposes laid out in the conceptual map. What other paradigms either ignore or only barely recognize, gaming embraces wholeheartedly. For those who see such competitive elements as being counterproductive, a defense of controlled competitiveness will follow.

6. DOES GAMING INTEGRATE THE PARADIGMS?

Obviously, the answer here is, again, yes. As we have seen in this chapter, gaming does not ask for any of the paradigms to be rejected, but merely assigns various simulated roles to them and then allows debaters to use them as they see fit.
7. DOES GAMING PROVIDE A DIRECT LINK TO COMMUNICATION THEORY?

While gaming has been applied by many disciplines, it has been specifically adopted by portions of the speech communication field. Gaming has been adopted as a teaching methodology, and is widely used in some speech departments as a mode of instruction for introductory communication classes. Gaming has been used as a method for understanding conflict resolution, as was demonstrated in an examination of game theory earlier. Gaming has been used as an advanced form of communication itself among futurists and among students of international affairs, as was seen in the work of Bremer. Gaming has, finally, been used as a paradigm, though as of yet unrecognized, for academic debate.

8. THE GAMING PARADIGM IS COMPREHENSIVE

Over and over again, the paradigms have been indicted because they tend to break down at certain points. They are like great tents which attempt to cover the landscape—-they certainly cover a large area, though often overlapping, but they can never hope to cover the whole territory. For each paradigm, there are significant and important portions of the academic debate experience which are NOT treated.

The same cannot be said of gaming. The marvel of the game design model of Duke is that it applies, step by step, so explicitly to academic debate. In so doing, the entire activity seems to have been included within a gaming structure. As a doubting individual, I have
been searching for things in modern debate which do not relate, logically and easily, to gaming. In an attempt to provide credibility to my own presentations, I have attempted to find shortcomings, areas where gaming cannot explain the debate phenomena. The search continues.

The major portions of the debate experience not explained by the paradigms are: competition, the iterative nature of debate, and the assignment of specific sides on an alternative basis. Gaming, however, easily embraces these elements. Competition is an inherent element of "playing" a "game." The iterative nature of debate is duplicated by the theoretical importance of iterations in gaming. Gaming, as observed earlier, relies on iteration of the same interaction with a system as an important requirement for education. Finally, gaming explains the need to assign different roles. Within a game, you can learn something by playing and assuming a given "role." However, this is certainly not the only way you can learn. You will probably learn more on additional iterations where you play within OTHER roles.

C. CONCLUSIONS

Gaming emerges from this chapter as not just another paradigm which "competes" for followers along with the other paradigms, but as an overarching paradigm capable of providing some merger of the various existing paradigmatic perspectives. Gaming can account for the various advantages of the existing paradigms through their utilization as symbolic roles while at the same time providing a comprehensive
structure for debate which none of the paradigms can provide. It was also demonstrated now gaming as an overarching paradigm avoided the general charges made against the paradigms in chapter one.

However, if gaming only serves to incorporate the existing paradigms and the existing reality of the "new" debate into a new structure, there is some need to show that gaming can provide an answer to the many criticisms which exist concerning academic debate. Through an analysis of these charges and an explication of a gaming perspective, this will be done in chapter five.
CHAPTER FIVE
GAMING AND THE "EXCUSES" OF THE "NEW" DEBATE.

A number of well reasoned criticisms currently exist of modern academic debate. It is my purpose to explain these criticisms and then to illustrate their limitations and their weaknesses as applied to gaming as a paradigm for academic debate. However, some objections cannot be answered fully at this time, although gaming may provide clues as to how we can redefine our activity or our goals as necessary.

A. THE EXCUSES DEFINED

The critics of modern debate usually are not those actively involved with coaching at the time of their writing. Usually they are retired debate coaches or which there are so many in the communication field) or other members of the discipline who have experienced debate with reservations.

Kovalcheck has observed that there have always been those who have predicted "doom" for academic debate because it does not meet their expectations or their memories. These attacks have often been delivered by those who do not understand the practices they are criticizing, or by people who hate the competitive nature of debate to
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Perhaps what has not been recognized by these critics is that academic debate is like other symbolic acts...it takes place within a certain timeframe. What was familiar and proper in the timeframe of one outstanding speech scholar's debate experience may no longer apply. Pratt and Schnoor have observed that:

We are all getting older, and the new folks who are moving into forensics aren't quite the same as we were. Which brings us to the new generation. They're not the same. (Again, whether that's good or bad is another question.) There's a great deal of turnover among program directors... People get burned out, or are recognized for their great talents and transformed into deans or presidents. Some seek fame and fortune (usually fortune) in the world of business. Most people don't look upon directing forensics as a choice assignment.

While some decry that debate is changing, writers like Pratt and Schnoor recognize this inevitability.

A final step in understanding this process of change has been taken by others. If change is bound to come in academic debate, how will the individuals who are comfortable with the debate of today react to the debate of tomorrow? Will they simply slip into the role of doomsayers for debate because it is no longer what they are familiar with? My experience is that an intellectually appropriate stand for the scholar interested in academic debate is to expect change and become part of that change. If we find success in the debate that exists today, we must be alert to the possibility that we will simply become another
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"vested interest" which opposes anything new and different tomorrow. Hynes has confronted this possibility, and expressed what must be seen as a personal hope for his own future role as a debate theorist:

I have devoted a great number of hours to academic debate—both as an advocate and as an educator. I have strong beliefs that what I do has value for the students with whom I am associated. I hope that as the activity continues to evolve—as it did from syllogistic disputation—I can accept such evolution, and evaluate it justly. Debate is by no means the final word in educational methods. In this regard I hope we can continue to make improvements in the future. I hope that all of us can adapt to those changes, and avoid attacking an activity which should continue to attract good minds to the speech profession. I am certain that the future will bring some things to debate which I will view as the beginning or the end of the activity—much in the same way that changes during the 1970's brought such cries from coaches and participants of earlier times. I hope when that time comes, I will remember the intellectual challenge and competition which I believe will always remain the core of the activity—and remain silent when tempted to call once again for the return to debate when it was great.

Hynes is certainly not the first coach to preach such concerns. I personally have felt such temptations, and I have heard some of the coaches I have developed the most respect for say that after many years of involvement, it takes a positive, individual effort to remain the pilot or an open mind on the question of academic debate.

The critics, however, have a common expression that "debate isn't what it used to be" (which most things seldom are) and "it can't be understood by the common person." Having dealt with the constraints of
the passage of time, our attention is now directed to the criticism
which seems to underlie all of the specific changes we will examine
shortly -- namely that debate "isn't like real life."

This position has been expressed in a number of different ways.
Harris and Smith have written that academic debate can be thought of
as a "closed system," in that it does not interact with the environment
in which it finds itself. This position expresses that the needs and
preferences of society, in general are not considered by those within the
closed system or academic tournament debate. Huebner, in addressing
the American Forensic Association, cautioned about the danger that
debaters are "actually being trained so that they cannot speak
effectively before lay audiences." Citing his own experience, he charges
that many debaters will have "to work to break habits that were valuable
in the typical tournament debate situation but were irrelevant and even
counterproductive elsewhere." The tournament has been seen as a very
distorting element by those who call for a close relationship between
competitive debate in academic areas and debate in all other portions of
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society. Harris and Smith have identified the tournament as the chief culprit in making debate in a closed system. Brockriede has charged that "the tournament itself has no counterpart in the real world. More important, preparation for many debates on the same proposition for seven months calls forth methods of efficiency and standardization that would be appropriate rarely, if ever, in public debating. Gradually, the tournament debate has become more and more artificial." This charge is too much to accept. One must remember that the classroom has no counterpart in the real world either, but probably is valuable because it is a part of the real world. As well, one marvels at the contention that there is no counterpart in the real world where persons prepare for months at a time to discuss and defend specific policies. Certainly any federal administrator testifying before Congress, any expert witness appearing before a regulatory commission, any public relations officer linked to a specific undertaking, would be in similar situation. Brockriede makes another charge with similar weaknesses. He notes that college debate is not at all like the confrontation politics of the real world. Brockriede pictures two scenes taking place close to one another: one a debate and
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the other a "real world" confrontation.

The first affirmative debater is saying, "My colleague and I are happy to be here today to debate the vital resolution that the federal government should grant annually a specific percentage of its income tax revenue to the state governments. In order to ensure that both teams understand the proposition in the same way, we shall define three terms..." Meanwhile, outside the classroom building, students are showing one another to get at a microphone so they can debate the question of whether they should seize the administration building or merely march on the president's home.

One is understandably sympathetic to the fact that Brockriede is, himself, speaking in the time frame of 1970, thus illustrating a point made earlier. However, this is a favorable comparison between two types or debate procedures, as it is also a favorable comparison that this sort of academic debate seems to have outlived the sort Brockriede mentions as a feature of the 1970 campus. The point is simple, debate need not imitate all it sees in the "real world," it merely has to be part of that reality in and of itself.

Finally, some have stressed that current academic debate is too particularized to be compared to "real life." Kovalcneck has argued that debate research and analysis skills are not suitable to leadership. In commenting about leaders of the past and present who came from academic debate backgrounds he writes, "Those leaders of the past and the present did not spend all of their time in the library trying to find a disadvantage to III-A-1." While certainly agreeing that no one
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ever existed who spent "all" of their time doing any such sort of thing, this claim is otherwise hard to understand. Does this mean that attention to detail is not important in leadership roles in modern society? Does this mean that research is not important? Does this mean devotion to creative analysis and linkage of related concepts is not important? It seems clear to me that all of these activities are terribly important if leaders are to effectively deal with a world characterized in this work as complex, dynamic, and undergoing an information explosion.

This position, therefore, demands that academic debate correspond to what one finds in the rest of our experience. There seem to be several weaknesses in this position, especially as it is advanced against the "new" debate, which I have characterized as a game.

First, these criticisms neglect the dramatic elements of the "new" debate. The game of debate does not claim to be "real life," but it claims to be part of a real experience (recalling Meaney's urging to students, "You are real, your arguments are real, your opponents are real, this is a real debate") as well as being enough like some portion of experience to be a useful learning tool. In referring to specific games (EQUATIONS and POLICY NEGOTIATIONS GAME) Goodman notes that the games themselves contain a dramatic element, an engaging involvement for

the players although they realize that it is never "for real." This engagement is what is important, for "every engaged player wins, perhaps not blue chips or a new contract, but some further insight, some glimpses, however tentative, or further discovery." Goodman notes that it is the dramatic quality of games that makes them engaging enough to be educational. Players feel as if they are "engaged" in the game, literally a part of it. Yet, the game is not "real" in a sense of directly influencing events outside of the game, which Goodman notes as the "tentative" nature of games. Goodman realizes, however, that some might see a contradiction between the game being "engaging" and "tentative" at the same time. In explaining away this contradiction, Goodman seems to answer the charge that debate is not "real life" and also address issues related to flat power, a point where debate's interface with the real world is discussed in theory. Goodman writes,

If the combination of engagement and tentativeness seems paradoxical, it is the same paradox that has, throughout the years, made the drama an important human activity. Those who are concerned with the "validity" of academic games are very much like those who are concerned with the absolute realism of drama. Both have made the error of confusing the way things would be if they were to occur with the likelihood that this or that would occur, demanding the latter when it is the former which is of central importance. Although not "for real" in the sense of an absolute correspondence to life, both drama and gaming draw much of their force because they both show, in their abstraction from life, a high degree of correspondence to the
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way things might work out if they were "for real".

The point made here is that we do not engage in gaming because it is "the way things are" but because such engagement will give us knowledge we might be able to apply to the "way things are." Goodman states that games and playing have both intrinsic consummatory value and extrinsic instrumental value. It is because of this that we value the experience of dramatic literature as part of our lives. "I propose...that certain types of academic games are to be especially valued not simply as attractive ways of packaging essentials, but as one of a very few ways of furthering the ends of educators committed to guided discovery." Critics or debate because it is not "real life" are confusing the essential educational role of academic debate. The game of debate need not closely follow "real life" (whatever that may be), but provide an educational experience for students and coaches. As Goodman explains, "To move greater numbers of students beyond a concept of learning which involves the mastery of essentials, to get more students engaged in explorations of the type which are normally the prerogative of the very gifted or the very mature would be no small accomplishment." The engaging, tentative, dramatic qualities of gaming provide a "real" education, and that is what this view of academic debate calls for.
A second weakness in the "debate must be like real life" position is that it is not one to be applied to other portions of the educational discipline. Frankly, as a teacher of communication and argumentation, I would not particularly relish being advised on how to teach it by those who know very little about it. Likewise, I am not discouraged when someone who has never seen a debate tells me that they would like better if it were done "differently." As some educators have stated, one part of the educational tradition is that it cannot necessarily be effectively critiqued and designed by those who are not professional educators. As some expert knowledge is essential for being a good educator, so it is that while feedback from laymen is useful, it should not be seen as the guiding criteria for the design of educational activities.

Third, it seems clear that in many ways the "new" debate teaches some very important skills. In many ways academic debate is a very appropriate training ground for students interested in success at the "real life" level. Modern debaters attempt to win, and they utilize a number of tactics to achieve this goal. This problem-solving, competitive activity can be useful for learning to "win" in society. An interesting spokesperson for this view is Palmieri, who has written:

Those who portray debate as an "educational experience" never tell you what good the education does you once you have achieved it. The tacit fact is that an education in argumentation to acquire skills to express yourself succinctly, intelligently and persuasively is an education to enable you to win at endeavors within and outside the debate circle. Argumentation as a learning device for critical decision-making and strategic moves is of no consequence unless the end result is that the decisions you make are correct, the tactics you use are the best, and the
Final outcome of the encounter is the attainment of your desired goal.

Palmieri's point here is not that winning is everything, and not that the specific debate skills do not matter in real life. His point is that by placing the student in a competitive intellectual situation, the student learns how to reason, persuade, and compete, skills which will be of inestimable value in the remainder of the student's life. Some might argue that winning in this sense involves persuading only specialists and experts, and thus is of little value after the student's competitive career is over. This is also a raise charge, since many of the situations students find themselves involved in later will also involve argument within a specialized field to which they will have to adapt. Adaptation, in Palmieri's view is what a student often learns in debate. There certainly is no indication that all judges are "expert," or that they all agree on how the debate should proceed. Debaters must adapt to many different situations, which is one of the unique values of the activity. As Palmieri notes, "...I am too cognizant of reality not to be constantly aware that my ability to adapt in debate rounds is a small-scale "conflict, consensus, and compromise" format that will be repeated countless times in the years to come."
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A fourth weakness in the position that "debate should be like real life" is that it involves an improper educational perspective. Many critics of debate have argued that judges must "fight back with the ballot" in order to "force debaters to do the right thing," a perspective which is a bit frightening. The educational process is not one where "I know what is right, and you had better do what I do." Frankly, education SHOULD be a process through which both students and teachers learn. As well, students must learn things in their own way and for their own purposes. Goodman notes that there are two views of education: essentialism and non-essentialism. Essentialism argues that there is a very discrete body of data which comprise "knowledge," and that all students need to do is master or memorize these bits of data. Non-essentialist methods would tend to stress general intellectual operations, habits of mind, and heuristics. Educators who demand that students "do it their way" seem to be basically essentialistic. There is a distorting tone among many who demand that academic debate come back to "real life," a tone that says it is up to the teachers and the coaches to punish and force students into proper roles. Morello exhibits just such a tone. He argues that a lack of concern for delivery has turned intercollegiate debating into a "boring and isolated endeavor." The task he sees at hand is a tough one. He
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writes, "At the outset, we should observe that the task of forcing debaters to improve habits of oral communication will not be accomplished easily." Not only is it necessary to FORCE debaters to follow what Morello thinks is appropriate, but he expects considerable resistance from debaters. Morello has developed a number of ways in which those who "know better" can force those who do not to follow his guidelines. Besides voting against those students who do not conform to his standards, he urges that we debate only simplified topics, shortening speeches so that students can't go into much detail, to demand only the random assignment of judges, and to break the hold that "big schools" have on the National Debate Tournament. These particular proposals seem to be prescriptive and have a tinge of "sour grapes." Morello seems to be stating that he wants academic debate to follow a certain model, and he wants to force others to obey, even though the vast majority are not following his guidelines presently. As educators, forensic professionals need to be alert to these implications of our demands for change in debate. We must not engage in ideological battles of this nature against the students we are trying to serve.

Thus, the basis for many of the criticisms we are about to encounter is that debate is not like "real life" and that it should be. This position is seen as objectionable both practically and philosophically.

Morello, p. 107.
In expressing their unhappiness with modern debate, some have seen the "gaming" nature of it as harmful. In relating a personal reaction or this nature, England noted:

A couple of years ago, when I walked out of my first round of "top level varsity" debate, I saw a former debater from a "major debate Power." I commented that debate seemed to be a game between machines throwing out as many evidence cards as possible. I was expecting to get a speech on the value of such an "educational experience" as debate, but was shocked when he simply replied with a "That's right, it's just a game."

Frankly, I would have to agree. Debate is a game. However, this does not mean that it isn't a valuable, important and educational game. As a game it differs from the rest of "real life," but that does not mean it does not prepare us for the rest of our lives.

With these thoughts in mind, we now turn to an examination of the various excesses which some have identified in modern debate.

1. SPEED IN COMMUNICATION

When someone who has never seen a round of academic debate witnesses one for the first time, he/she is likely to remark, first and foremost, that the participants tend to speak rapidly. There is no doubt that the speed of communication in a debate is above that usually found in a conversation or in a presidential speech.
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In my analysis of this speed in communication, the term used to describe this phenomena will be "the spread." This term is the one commonly used by debaters to describe high speed in communication, as strategically one team tries to lay down a "spread" of arguments the other team cannot answer. The spread is an attempt to utilize time as a strategy in the debate.

A valuable contribution to the evaluation of the spread comes from Ulrich in an unpublished paper entitled, "Gone with the Wind: the Spread in American Debate." While attacks on the spread seem manifold, few have stepped forward to defend it, and certainly fewer have done so as eloquently as Ulrich.

Before examining the criticisms of this practice, we need to define it. Ulrich has defined the spread as being characterized by two features. First, a large number of individual arguments are presented in a spread. For example, a single argument by one side might be answered by the other side with five or six individual arguments. Second, a spread debate requires a rapid rate of delivery in order to present the increased number of arguments, and often teams attempt to "outrun" their opponents. Thus, the "spread" is a feature of modern
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debate may be contrasted with the slower, more persuasive styles of traditional and public debates. Judges have, of course, reacted to the spread as it has emerged in academic debates. Some judges have dealt with this issue quite specifically. Cox, in an examination of the judging philosophies at the National Debate Tournament, related some of these complaints. When the use of the a spread led to analytical or communicative abuses judges tended to condemn the technique. Debate needed to be "at all times clear and understandable." Judges cautioned that the rate of delivery must not exceed the ability of the judge to assimilate and evaluate critically the arguments being made. Cox listed a number of abuses which judges detected in some uses of the spread. These included:

(a) incoherence, (b) inadequately explained and supported arguments, (c) the lack of clear transitions and progression of discourse, (d) "repetition of essentially identical arguments," (e) failure to weigh discrete arguments or assign priority for the judge's interpretation, and (f) failure "to extend and apply analysis," especially in rebuttals.

Several writers in the debate field have been very critical of the spread. Fisher and Kovalcheck have observed that such practices as the spread have arisen because of three factors. First, there is a

276
Cox, p. 70.

277
Ibid.

278
desire to achieve a breadth of argument so that when one position fails, victory can be achieved through another one. Second, the overwhelming need for efficiency has driven debaters to adopt such practices. Third, judges have given their tacit approval to such practices by permitting them to be utilized strategically in gaining decisions.

This condition has led to numerous expressions of disappointment. Towne, for example, has written,

...contemporary intercollegiate debating seems hell-bent on training students to be the sophisticated computer skilled in spewing reams. While our debate theory would argue for the superiority of quality of argument over quantity of argument, our practice frequently reverses the relationship. Quantity rules quality. And, in the process of this reversal, our debaters (and later I shall argue, judges as well) are forced ever more and more to become machine.

Towne goes on to note that we live in an "age of speed" and our debaters are becoming speedier too. One marvels that this recognition can be made without the obvious connection being made. In an age of speed debate is becoming faster, and the critics of the spread say this is wrong. Does this mean that they advocate that debate NOT follow the trends set in society? Does this position seem contradictory with a "real world" perspective? For now, it is sufficient to say that no such connection is made by the critics of the spread.
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Critics of the spread also have their survey data. Olsen conducted a survey on the attitudes on the spread. A survey was distributed to Delta Sigma Kho-Tau Kappa Alpha member schools. Needless to say, the attitudes supposedly discovered by this survey evaluated the spread in a very negative manner. However, there exist major problems in the design of this survey. For example, all question items evaluated the spread in a very negative light so that all answers of "agree" give the spread a negative evaluation. Also, the spread was always described as "the excessive spread," thus negating the value of the answers. For example, there is little wonder that many agreed with the statement, "The excessive spread prevents the development of arguments on the part of both teams." It is hard to evaluate something which is "excessive" very positively. Nevertheless, those answering the survey backed off when it was suggested by one item that teams be penalized for an "excessive" spread. While a vast majority of respondents rated the spread as harmful on earlier issues, a clear majority of respondents would not advocate actively penalizing a team that used an "excessive spread." Thus, while many may speak against the spread in abstract, most respondents refused to accept Morelio's option of "forcing" the issue on others.

Criticism of the spread is not new in debate. In 1968, for
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example, Swinney wrote that the spread was going to be the downfall of competitive tournament debate. Needless to say, over a decade later tournament debate still exists much as it did in 1968, with some changes, of course, and the pace of the average speech has, in my judgement, increased. Fast talking, argued Swinney, spells the failure of academic debate to operate as a laboratory in communication.

There are several weaknesses in this position. First, critics of the spread seem to have misunderstood the realities of comprehension rates. For example, the judges surveyed by Cox previously did not object to "the spread" but to the problems inherent when debaters crossed over a comprehension threshold. Respondents to Wilson's survey, for example, were probably thinking of the incomprehensible when they were answering questions about the "excessive spread." As well, the specific abuses cited by Cox previously also entail comprehension and assimilation difficulties.

The basic assumption of the critics of the spread is that it is "too fast to understand." Frankly, the empirical evidence does not bear
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this cut. Orr found that average persons comprehend material very well at speeds well above that of normal conversation. Speed in communication can often be an educational aid. As a student I found myself far more interested in lectures presented at a faster pace and filled with material than by leisurely addressed by faculty. Students in universities, for example, are now listening to lectures which have been artificially speeded up. Small snippets of words have been removed so that the lecture material comes at a faster pace without increasing in pitch. The results of such "spread lecture" tapes has been an increase in comprehension of the material. It cannot be assumed that an increase in speed necessarily leads to decreased comprehension, though certainly some trade off point will probably exist at some high speed. Is debate above or below the optimal speed? This is probably an individualized question, but there is certainly no doubt that a lot of comprehension is taking place when the vast majority of judges listen to a round or debate. Judges continue to make decisions and write the reasons for those decisions. There is no doubt that it often takes an effort on the part of the judge to comprehend some portions of the spread, but it can be and is being done at tournaments all over the nation.
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Second, some speed in communication may increase the incentive for debaters to make "good" arguments. If an argument presented is "weak," it takes very little time to answer or dismiss without an answer. As Urich notes,

One line repairs can be minimized by pointing out that no mechanism is given to put them into operation and that no impact is given. Disadvantages can be answered by pointing out weaknesses in norm or causal link. Given the nature of debate, the attacker does not have time to rebuild all or these attacks in rebuttal. The best strategy would be to fully develop all arguments as rapidly as possible in the first stand on the floor, and thus pre-empt all easy answers by the other team. The team that spreads has no reason to allow the other team to beat its attacks just by pointing out they were not fully developed in the initial presentation.

Another reason for the spread to operate as an incentive to good argumentation is the ability of the opponent to group "bad" arguments and thus nullify the original "spread." If many of the arguments presented have common flaws, or if they are merely repetitions of previous arguments, the opposition could dispose of large portions of them by making a few key arguments. As Urich notes, "This time wasting cannot be afforded in a spread round. The incentive, then, is to present as large a number of good arguments as possible in order to overburden the other team and cause them to make an error."

Third, the spread emphasizes the need for economy of language.
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Often the layman thinks of the speech discipline and "academic" debates as a lot of empty rhetoric. Politicians and their speechwriters are constantly decried as using a lot of flowery words without a lot of substance. Millions of students have been trained in composition through the use of Strunk and White's *Elements of Style*, which cautions writers and communicators to avoid using needless words and phrases. Word economy is an important guideline for communication.

It seems clear that when students have to utilize time as a competitive element within the debate, they are forced to pay more attention to their use of superfluous phrases and circumlocutory patterns of delivery. As Ulrich notes, "Given a finite time period and a large number of attacks, the debater must be able to state arguments in the fewest number of words possible." Ulrich gives the example of John F. Kennedy, who in writing his inaugural address paid attention to what made the addresses of Jefferson, Lincoln, and Roosevelt great, their economy of language. Never use two words when one will do.

Fourth, the spread may teach students valuable skills of emphasis. If there are a large number of arguments in a given debate, it will not
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be possible to deal with all of them in rebuttal speeches which are half as long as the constructive speeches. Thus, students must choose between arguments and emphasize those which are most important. As Ulrich observes, "If a team is clearly winning an important issue, they will usually emphasize this point in some way, spending a minute on an attack is hardly the only way to emphasize an argument." Eman and Lukehart state that when a large number of arguments are advanced in a round, emphasis and selection are essential, since "...information theory indicates that with rapid delivery a reiteration of important points by restatement and summary provides listeners a better opportunity to process information in quantity."

Finally, and as will be explained presently, the spread forces debaters to pick the most important issues, and thus forces them to engage in stochastic processes which call upon all or their analytical and intellectual abilities.

Of course, the spread may have a number of strengths beyond those mentioned here. Ulrich has summarized some of them.
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The spread can be used to probe the other team's case for weaknesses. To answer all of the attacks without contradiction or giving a weak answer requires a great deal of skill, which can be useful even outside a debate round. The spread also demonstrates a great deal of preparedness on the topic, and encourages research.

My position here is not that the "excessive spread" is good, but that speed in communication involves a variety of factors not dealt with by the critics of the spread. Time, and the speed of play, are important portions of the game of debate. If a determination of "excessive" must be made, it should be done through a discussion of heuristics -- academic debate when seen as a "guide to discovery."

Gaming also provides a useful perspective on these issues. Duke notes that in a game of any complexity, which the game of debate certainly would be, a variety of information pulses will be simultaneously in play during any given moment of the game. He notes that the pace (rate of play) in the game will be closely associated with the level of abstraction and the amount of information involved. By these two criteria, it is no wonder that the speed if play is somewhat rapid. The level of abstraction in the game of debate is very high, since the only information really loaded into the frame game system is the scenario, or resolution. Debaters supply all of the other details in the debate, so it is no wonder that they proceed quickly into such a void. As well, the amount of information is considerable in a debate,

and thus players must move quickly in order to be able to deal with it in given time limits. Duke notes that the actual pace of play will probably be determined by the players and operators. He advises ten trial runs, at least, in order to arrive at any conclusion about the speed of play. Thus, we cannot specify the speed of play, nor can we assume that one round of debate which is "too fast" indicates that the game or debate in general is "too fast."

The game of debate operates very nicely to regulate the speed of play. In most instances, debaters attempt to manipulate speed of play in order to win and judges attempt to do the best they can at comprehending such moves. The success of these strategies is dependent on the debaters being comprehended. Cox round that almost all of the judges at the National Debate Tournament displayed a willingness to flowchart a spread round. Only a few indicated they gave low points for such tactics. Most seemed to believe believe that the ultimate value of competitive debate was "analysis" and not "oratory." Judges engage in a regulation of the speed of delivery by their decisions and approaches to it. Cox evaluated it this way,

...judges drew a distinction between the proper use of
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multiple arguments (spread) and the abuses of this technique. "I find the well-developed, well-evidenced spread to be the best and most effective debating," one critic commented. "On the other hand, a spread without substance I find reprehensible." Since debaters function "within certain time and topic restraints," it is perhaps understandable that a discourse featuring rapid delivery and multiple extensions of arguments should evolve. Many judges, therefore, "attempt to evaluate how well a team functions within those constraints." Do the debaters maintain a clear, cogent organization in outlining multiple arguments? Do they deal intelligently with the critical issues in rebuttals? As a tool of policy analysis, the "spread" ideally should be used "to expand a number of good arguments rather than muddle a greater number of poor ones." Several judges remarked that they "appreciated a mechanically proficient spread" or "enjoy a high quality spread round."

Judges who are taking positions such as these as well as recognizing the need for comprehension seem capable of regulating the speed of communication in the game of debate. Pace of play can be regulated by players and judges, and need not be regulated by one strict standard.

2. Two COMPETITIVE

Debate is a competitive game in many respects. While the cooperation between team members, team/coach cooperation, and squad cooperation are important, the central drama of academic debate remains the competition between the teams in the round.

Directors of forensics seem to recognize the competitive nature of debate. Smith and Harris report on a survey of 140 randomly selected
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intercollegiate debate programs. The data revealed that 77% of the respondents concentrated between 90% and 100% of their coaching efforts on the competitive experience. In terms of justifications for increased financial support, 33.6% would base their request on some combination of the number of tournaments attended, reputation of the debate program, or the winning percentage. 13.7% argued about an educational value for debate either independently or in conjunction with any of the other choices. In public advocates of academic debate are less likely to flaunt the competitive nature of the activity. Debaters themselves are not encouraged to dwell on the "win/loss" nature of the game, yet almost all debaters recognize the importance of winning and losing. Palmieri noted this paradox.

It seems unfortunate to me that many coaches consider it bad taste for an individual to desire, above virtually all else, to win. Although shocking and no doubt vulgar to admit, I primarily debate to succeed. ... Most people on the circuit refuse to admit to this position for it runs diametrically counter to current accepted mores of our community. The paradoxical fact is, however, that those who at first glance would appear to be disagreeing with my goal as paramount would, upon further examination, fall into the category they abhor.

The guiding example of this competitive model would seem to be the National Debate Tournament, sponsored by the American Forensic Association. Harris and Smith have identified the NDT as the model
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for the orthodox competitive format -- the tournament. They speculate that the concept of a "National Title" has now become so ingrained that even if the AFA banned the NDT, it would merely resurface under different sponsorship. The competitive element in academic debate is independent of sponsoring organizations, and has taken on a life of its own.

A number of critics of competitive debate have voiced disapproval of this state of things. There is an excess of competition in academic debate. It manifests itself in a number of ways.

First, the concept of competition for competition's sake is seen as essentially hollow. The mere fact of victory and triumph need to be connected directly to a tangible benefit. As one critic notes:

It undoubtedly will be said that winning is a sign of excellence. But the question is, "Excellence in what?" Certainly a trophy case filled with trophies indicates that debaters have excelled in that discipline. Yet, quite idealistically, I would contend that if that excellence is in a sophisticated display of one-upmanship, the victory is hollow and meaningless.

Competition cannot stand alone, but must be supported by other tangible reasons for having it.

It is difficult to argue this point. Certainly if excellence is
worthwhile; it must be excellence in something which is itself intrinsically worthwhile. Thus, win and loss cannot serve as justification alone, but as we shall see, it does not.

A second consideration is that competition harms the educational goals of the activity. One educational philosopher concerned with the effects of competition in educational activities is Combs. He has argued that competition tends to lead to conformity and a loss of valuable individual variation. He has noted that, "Competition can only work if people agree to seek the same goals and follow the same rules. Accordingly, as competitors strive to beat each other's records, they tend to become more alike."

While this claim might be true in some respects, it is certainly outweighed by the innovation which competition encourages. In academic debate the difference between a successful team and a mediocre team is often the ability to innovate — to develop new arguments, new positions, and new theoretical considerations. Conformity is certainly forwarded in that people borrow efficacious tactics from opponents, but it certainly also rewards innovation.
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competitive educational context), is damaging to individuals. Failure is seen by Combs as debilitating and destructive to human beings, while success is strengthening and sustaining. Failure brings a loss of self-confidence and an unwillingness to experiment. He concludes, "One shudders to think of the staggering losses in human potential the world has already suffered because of the belief in the value of failure."

Competition, of course, must be tempered. As George Leonard has noted,

There is nothing wrong with a little competition in the proper proportion. Like a little salt, it adds zest to the game and to life itself. But when the seasoning is mistaken for the substance, only sickness can follow. Similarly, when winning is "the only thing" it can lead only to eventual emptiness and anomie.

That competition can be harmful is not denied. However, Combs' approach that competition is ALWAYS harmful seems to go a bit far. Gaming recognizes the need to mix the influence of competition, by stating that competition is ONE of the three purposes of the game or debate. Certainly no one argues that in the "new" debate competition is the ONLY force present, as we shall see.
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Third, many feel that competition has created an elitist structure in competitive debate. The reality of winning and losing produces a number of different groups: winners, losers, 50%ers, etc. Often individuals see students and coaches as falling into these categories, and a process of stratification sets in. Winners begin to sense who they are, and then begin to associate more with other winners. Losers may sense who they are, become bitter at this identity, and sit together in one corner of the tournament parties and/or receptions complaining to each other.

The process continues at the institutional level, where debate schools are soon divided up on the basis of competitive success and size of program, which some claim go hand in hand. This results in what Montgomery calls SCUNPO forensics, operating at the level of a national circuit and in the quest of a national title. He defines SCUNPO as "Super-Competitive, National Prestige Oriented." Montgomery complains that SCUNPO programs cannot fairly compete with the average forensic program. They tend to humiliate others on the regional level, outspend and thus outprepare their students, drain away talent with scholarship funds, and create an elitist atmosphere where SCUNPO can only associate with other SCUNPO. Frankly, this concept is inappropriate, inaccurate, and offensive. Any vision of academic debate as controlled by a few superpower institutions is absurd.
Montgomery is correct that winners associate with winners, but the nature or the program itself is rarely related to such elitism or even to winning. One good coach and two good debaters (and often, just one or two good debaters) are all that is needed to make a school a "winner" in the short term. Schools such as Canisius College come to mind as examples, where there are seldom more than two or three debaters but the national competitive success is substantial. A search for the "national powers" who have managed to dominate the National Forensic League nationals will reveal that there are few if any. Every year dark horse teams perform amazingly well. Morello, for example, claims that the same schools tend to dominate the National Debate Tournament over and over again, and that new, young debate programs just cannot break into the elimination rounds. Frankly, the results of the National Debate Tournament belie this. Each year there are the surprise teams, such as Odessa Junior College in 1981, Southwest Missouri State in 1973, and little known Brown University in 1972. Meanwhile, the major debate powers find rough sledding at the NDT. For example, in 1981 the University of Redlands had two teams which were granted first round at-large bids as being among the sixteen best teams in the nation, yet neither of them made the elimination rounds. Thus, complaints come from all sides. Some claim that they should do better at NDT after a successful year, while others claim that there are too many "automatic" successes.
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Elitism is probably a human phenomenon, and is only loosely linked to the competitive process. Absent competition in the open, pecking orders are likely to be set up in different ways. There is no strong invariable relationship between competition and elitism.

Most of the attention given to competition has been to decry its existence and to make apologies for it. There seem to be, however, a number of productive roles for competition in academic debate.

First, competition and differential judgement are an important component of living in the modern world. The individual is judged for purposes of educational advancement, suitability for educational opportunity, assignment to work roles, attainment of status in the community, and tickets for the baseball playoffs. An individual is often marked for life by the contents of his/her resume, a statement and scorecard of how your competition has gone so far in your life. Competition is reality and we must confront it. We do so, not by making competition the be all and end all of our activity, but by recognizing it, utilizing it, and keeping it under control. For example, George Herbert Mead has noted that within games, play can be said to be a serious preparation and role rehearsal. In noting that games are really
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rehearsals for grander purposes later in life, Avedon has quoted St. Augustine in this regard. He writes in Confessions, Book I:10,

...but we enjoyed playing games and were punished for them by men who played games themselves. However, grown-up games are known as "business" and even though boys' games are much the same, they are punished for them by their elders. No one pities either the boys or the men, for surely we deserved pity, for I cannot believe that a good judge would approve of the beatings I received as a boy on the ground that my games delayed my progress in studying subjects which would enable me to play a less creditable game later in life...

Second, students should feel free to opt for competition if they wish. If a student ranks competition ahead of personal development, we might find this unfortunate, but nevertheless it is not our place to prohibit it. The purpose of debate is something an individual needs to determine. Palmieri opts for this sort of individual choice when he writes,

Thus, my realization and contention is that debate has no general purpose. In saying this I am not by any means denying the value of academic debate, but rather reinforcing it on an existential level. My belief is that each debater must establish objectives for himself and then attempt to attain them. I reject quite strenuously an overpowering set of goals that is revered and cherished as "correct" and "proper." By accepting such things as absolutes, one denies the fundamental right of the individual to choose which aspect of debate he wishes to emphasize in his career.
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If other goals are as important as or more important than competition, we should be able to convince those who are willing to listen, and should not need to impose various standards on them.

Third, competitive and educational aspects of debate can easily coexist. Wood has noted that the two should not be seen as mutually exclusive, but rather as supportive. He writes,

But competition should not be separated from the educational element. Although the writer will never condone "win at any cost" debate, he argues that the primary values and skills to be round in debating can best be gained by the student who is willing to commit himself to the educational rigor to learn debate on the competitive level. Too often the cry that debate is an educational, not a competitive, activity is a rationalization for not winning. It's often an excuse for not caring enough about debate to learn the persuasive, the research, and analytical, and the refutative skills that are so necessary to winning. The techniques needed to win a debate embody the very skills and attitudes that are identical with the educational values of debating.

To support this point made by Wood, Sutton-Smith has found a surprising agreement in the empirical literature concerning game-playing's contribution to the student's later development. Sutton-Smith notes that games are, in fact, models of competitive success. He notes that as one example, "games of strategy have been found un
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cross-cultural studies in association with psychological discipline and cultural complexity; and in studies within this culture, in association with higher status and higher intelligence. One may derive from this view that persons who are members of the families and the social stratum that is most actively involved in decision-making of the larger society "make use of" strategy games as a model of such decision-making. In terms of child character development, gaming can also have a very positive impact. Sutton-Smith notes that, "While this study supports the view that games as models are an expressive phenomena there is also a long standing assumption in the larger community that games also have a formative influence on child development, particularly "character" development."

A fourth position is that oral argument is inherently competitive. Oral argument implies that there is more than one point of view involved, they disagree, and that they vie for supremacy. As Wood notes, "...oral argumentation, by its very nature, is a competitive endeavor."

...competition, therefore, can be thought of as the context of oral
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argument and the context for debate. Wood contends that if it were not for the competitive element of debate, we would not be able to find as many attentive, trained listeners as we have found in debate judges, nor as many highly motivated critics as we find in our opponents in a debate. Competition makes this possible.

Although this position is recognized and often attacked by those opposed to the competitive aspects of debate, it remains true that competitive success is a measure of how much students are learning.

Wood notes,

Competitive success should not be a means for gratifying the ego of the coach or the debater or building the reputation of a school; it should be one of the measures of how much a student is learning about debate. These things, in turn, become very useful tools to the educated man who lives in a republic. They are the reasons for debating.

3. INFORMATION OVERLOAD

One often finds that newcomers to debate marvel at the amount of information dealt with in an average debate round. It is not unusual for a speaker to refer to forty-five or fifty different pieces of "evidence" to prove his/her points during a ten minute speech. Or
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course, elaborate flowcharting makes the tracking of such a volume of information possible, but often it takes considerable experience to be able to follow it all, and much is lost during the training period.

There seems little doubt that academic debate attempts to handle large amounts of information. Kovalcheck has noted that there has been an "information explosion" in debate during the last ten years. He lists some of the ramifications of this as being: tournaments are now longer, the workload for each debater has increased considerably, and a very long competitive season has been adopted. While these do seem to be somewhat related concerns, they miss what is the most obvious sign of information explosion -- the amount of supportive evidence which debaters carry around with them. Debaters find themselves complaining bitterly about the evidence load, but few want to leave very much of it behind. A team I coached at the NDT in 1981 had 21 separate pieces of luggage solely devoted to evidence and prepared materials.

Frankly, this sort of information explosion is to be expected in an activity such as debate. Eman and Lukhart utilize information theory to explain the information explosion in debate. They claim that questions and statements dealing with politics, religion, philosophy, and personal evaluations (which are all very typical in a debate, except
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religion) require complete thought processes and thus more information processing time. Drawing on other information theorists, they posit that if many different choices are open to an individual (which is certainly true in a debate) the complexity level will increase. They utilize these two explanations, both from information theory and both very applicable to academic debate, to help us in understanding why debate is an activity that utilizes large amounts of information.

The dispute about the amount of information in a debate does not center around whether a lot of information is utilized in the "new" debate, but about its advisability. Some of these objections will be examined now.

First, most arguments against the use of a lot of information in a debate have a lot in common with the objections to the "spread." Basically, it is argued that this situation must lead to confusion and bad practices. Without repeating the arguments offered in defense of the spread earlier, it is important to remember that the points made about the comprehension ability of those involved in a debate apply here. Eman and Lukenart, for example, argue that such a surge of information as takes place in a debate cannot help but lead to deleterious effects. They note,

information theorists have discovered that an excessive

---
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amount of information is accompanied by strain and stress which leads to a constraint on rational decision making.

319 Decker has argued that such an "information" glut must lead to harmful practices. Some of these which he has listed include: multiple files of evidence, spread debates, low grades, lack of evidentiary evaluation, distorted evidence, exotic affirmative cases, shallow analysis, rapid delivery, and disorganization. Frankly, this is a very impressive list, but it seems tenuous that more information has caused all of these supposed "evils." While many of these can be linked to speed or delivery, some seem linked to the information explosion specifically. These would be multiple files, low grades, lack of evidentiary evaluation, and exotic affirmative cases. With the first problem, it is hard to deny that an information explosion means debaters have to handle MORE information, so multiple files are inevitable. Frankly, it seems strange to yearn for the days when each team had a single evidence drawer or a recipe box with index cards. We are poor teachers if we are training students to use a recipe box when it seems clear that within fifteen years most of their homes will have computer outlets in them. "Low grades" would seem to indicate that debaters spend too much time doing research in the library so that they get lower grades in their other classes. While I am willing to agree that students should have a well-rounded education, it is a bit difficult to

Worry about students being educationally cheated when they are in the library engaging in self-designed research projects. In terms of lack of evidentiary evaluation, it seems to me that the information explosion makes evidence evaluation important as an argument for two reasons. First, if evidence is all-important, debaters will give it close scrutiny in their own best interest. Second, when two pieces of evidence collide, some way must be found by the debaters to indicate why one piece of information is superior to another. In terms of distorted evidence, high research levels probably limit this practice. If each team is constantly surveying and sifting through the literature, it is difficult to distort the conclusions of a report without being discovered. Frankly, my personal impression is that as more information has been used in debate rounds and researched by debaters, evidence falsification and distortion have DECREASED. Too many teams carry too many xeroxes or articles around for other teams to risk distortion. Finally, Decker charges that vast research has led to exotic affirmatives cases. One wonders, which came first here? Did high levels of research force affirmatives into the exotic, or did exotic cases by affirmatives force negatives to do more and more research? Sequential understanding of these elements may not be important, for it is probably true that both were important factors. In any case, Decker assumes that “exotic” means “bad,” while to me it merely means “different, perhaps new” which sounds like a desirable characteristic.

The result that critics of the information explosion in debate all seem to decry is information overload. Debate, they argue, operates on
the fringes of, and often well into, a region of information overload.

Eman and Lukenart, for example, charge that such a condition, based on information theory, may lead to confused thinking, inefficiency in attempts to exchange information with others, and a constraint on rational decision making. Of course, the problem here is the assumption that we are within the boundaries of information overload. As I will argue shortly, mechanisms exist to handle this information without overload.

A second indictment is that the information explosion has led to less than satisfactory research systems. Many debate teams now operate what is known as a "team evidence pool." Usually utilizing spirit duplication or photocopying, this system involves all members of the squad doing research and then distributing everyone's research to everyone else. In many of my personal experiences (Seton Hall University, Boston College, University of Kansas, Wayne State University, and the University of Vermont) squad evidence pools were either started by me or already found operating smoothly on my arrival. A few students have been especially critical of this practice. Perkins has written:

...the increased use of mimeographed evidence must make one wonder what type of research techniques are being taught. A
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student who receives mis testamentum ex machina cannot be expected to apply the tests of valid evidence. Furthermore, when one sees evidence carried in shopping carts and three suiters one must wonder how the individual debater managed to compile such vast amounts of evidence through personal scholarly research. Personally, it seems inconceivable that the student using duplicated evidence or carrying it in such quantities could have done the research, know the context of the evidence or form scholarly research habits.

While the presentation here is impressive, the logic does not seem extremely valid. A missed point is that in order to have a lot of evidence you need to have a lot of debaters doing the research. I can see the merit in this argument if a student only takes what others have produced and produces none or his/her own. However, a program devoted to strong research will demand participation by all as a matter of fairness. Also not understood is the necessity for students to read, file, and understand the evidence of others in order to use it in a debate round. Learning to create meaningful and useful evidence files out of large amounts of disparate information is a skill that all students could benefit by acquiring. Another missed point is that students learn about valid evidence through a squad system by application or standardized procedures. Any squad evidence pool must set down basic guidelines as to what citations are to be used on each piece, how context is to be determined, and on how research is to be divided. Finally, Perkins seems to conclude here that anything produced by a system and not found "personally" in the library is not scholarly. Frankly, this doesn't seem to follow. A scholar may be thought of as someone who understands information, knows how to use it, and can do research on particular topics. Certainly squad evidence systems attempt to teach these skills.
Many view the information explosion in debate with trepidation and fear. There is a sense that handling more information somehow depersonalizes us and makes us machine-like. As Brockriede said ten years before Kovalcheck’s announcement of a ten-year long information explosion, the modern debate tournament has become a battle for efficient, skilled computers. Such fears have considerable metaphorical impact, but it hardly seems convincing that handling more information will rob us of our “humanity” and turn us into robots. Initially, this seems to be a critique of personal style which has no place in a discussion of debate theory. As well, the experience of the debate round seems to deny this. At the end of a speech in which a student has attempted to handle a large amount of information, debaters seem very human. They are often a little short of breath, a little hot under the collar, and often very emotionally charged. This is hardly a mechanical image. How many evidence cards they utilize in a round rarely corresponds to my impression of individuals as cold and machine-like. Perhaps a future involving bio-mechanical interface as part of debate might address these issues, but for now debaters and coaches around me are very, often too, human.

The “new” debate seems to be able to deal with these large amounts of information. As was pointed out in chapter two, gaming is an excellent methodology for dealing with large amounts of information and
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how that information interacts in complex systems. If the "new" debate is to be thought of as a game, certainly it is well equipped to handle Becker's "information glut." A number of factors make handling large amounts of information possible in the "new" debate.

First, the "new" debate teaches students about how to get along in a world which is teetering on the edge of information overload itself. As Eman and Lukenart acknowledge, the world seems to be struggling against vast quantities of information, stemming from technological advances in handling information and from expanding bodies of literature. Debate can teach students, through its game format and its emphasis on information handling, how to survive in the world of increasing information flow.

Second, the "new" debate provides a number of different mechanisms for handling increased information loads. As Eman and Lukenart have acknowledged, a direct result of increased information flow in a debate is behavior by debaters and judges to cope with this information.

Perhaps the most important technique is flowcharting, a technique closely aligned with gaming. Since the communication sequence in a debate can be predicted, flowcharts have been designed to provide a
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mechanism for recording, analyzing, and utilizing information presented by opponent, colleague, and self. A good flowchart attempts to record what has been said by participants as well as showing how different positions on the same issue compare. Thus, a flowchart is a straight temporal record (each speech has its own column) while at the same time allowing for an item by item comparison between speakers (positions presented, attacked, defended, etc. by different teams).

Another mechanism is "chunking." Eman and Lukehart identify this practice as putting bits of information into set categories, to be resorted and reanalyzed there. Certainly, within gaming, supersymbolic service just this function by pointing out major points of contest, such as innerency, significance, etc.

Another coping mechanism is the preparation of evidence into "blocks" or arguments. Here, arguments which usually occur together are put together for easy preparation and use just before a speech. Kovalcheck, for example, has found this to be a poor method of dealing with information overload, since they are often full of "spurious causal leaps that no one other than a debate judge would take seriously," while being full of "jargon, signs and telescoped arguments." Of course, none of these things seems to be linked to the
use of "blocks," put to bad arguments. One would assume that in many instances, blocks of arguments carefully worked out in advance would be more reasonable than arguments slapped together at the last minute. Thus, debaters and judges have a number of coping mechanisms.

Third, who is to say how much information is too much? Towne observes that there are no simple answers in debate or in society, and then wonders about why he sees debaters pushing around shopping carts full of evidence. Obviously, the two might be connected. For now, suffice it to say that in a world of information explosion, the amount which is "enough" in debate will probably be considered by many as "too much," and objectionable because they are "multiple files." The world is more complex than a recipe box full of cuttings from today's newspapers. The "new" debate is in touch with the modern world in this regard.

Eeman and Lukenart have observed that in information theory, it is very difficult to measure the threshold level for information processing. Certainly it is no easier in debate, but there are certainly many reasons for believing that we cannot return to the information levels of the old debate through an "information implosion." Rather, our central task should be finding effective ways of coping with
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more information. As we have seen, debaters and judges already use a number of mechanisms. Perhaps the most valuable mechanism for neutralizing information overload would be to select those bits of information which are most important and emphasize those. If debaters could learn, as a generalized skill, now to tell the wheat from the chaff, we would have accomplished something. The "new" debate teaches students about such processes. In a debate a large number of issues are introduced. It is probably not possible, especially in rebuttal periods, to deal with all of them. On this ground the critics of debate are correct. However, they stop here and assume that this is a bad thing. It seems that in a world experiencing information overload, these are important skills to teach.

329

Gregory Bateson's conception of "stochastic" processes is relevant. Bateson defines "stochastic" in the glossary of *Mind and Nature* by writing, "(Greek: stochazein, to shoot with a bow at a target; that is, to scatter events in a particularly random manner, some of which achieve a preferred outcome) if a sequence of events combines a random component with a selective process so that only certain outcomes of the random are allowed to endure, their sequence is said to be stochastic." Bateson observes that the two most important stochastic
processes influencing man are evolution and learning. It is with the learning portion of the concept with which debate is concerned.

Creative thinking and the ability to select portions of a seemingly random environment are linked to the stochastic process or learning. Asndy pointed out that no system (neither computer nor organism) can produce anything new unless the system contains some source of the random. In the computer, this will be a random-number generator which will ensure that the "seeking," trial-and-error moves of the machine will ultimately cover all the possibilities of the set to be explored. Bateson would agree, that "creative thought is fundamentally stochastic" and that it is the ability to select from a treatment of the random that is important to learning.

Surely debate does this, and very well. Issue selection and argument integration are the two hardest things to teach debaters, probably because they are the most important things debate has to teach. In a world of information explosion, the debater may be able to avoid information overload through proper stochastic manipulation learned in the heat of competition.
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8. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we have discussed the concepts of the "old" and the "new" debate. Gaming has emerged not as a mutually exclusive paradigm, but as an overarching paradigm capable of assimilating the valuable portions of all of the paradigms. A list of the common "excesses" found in modern debate was examined. In relation to these excesses, they were dealt with in terms of the problems inherent in the criticisms themselves as well as an analysis of how gaming dealt with these problems.

There are a number of viable concerns about what the "new" debate is up to. After reviewing these charges, however, it is apparent that they do not invalidate the experience of the "new" debate nor do they deny the validity of the gaming approach. Gaming, as we shall see in chapter six, not only answers criticisms about the "new" debate as it exists today, but points the way for the "new" debate to go from here.
4. ETHICAL PROBLEMS

Although not a common complaint in print, it is not uncommon to near coaches, students, and interested others express concern over certain supposedly "unethical" practices which take place in academic debate. Comments are often heard that debaters and coaches have "lost" their values, and that certain competitors will "do anything to win." My purpose here will be to identify ethical concerns, both legitimate and illegitimate, and then examine the ability of the "new" debate and gaming in particular to deal with these complaints. Certainly there are some activities in academic debate which can be identified as involving unethical practices. In speaking of ethics in debate, it is important to recall the criteria of honesty established in chapter three. Thus, truly unethical debate practices, at least to me, involve some breach in this ethic of honesty.

The first ethical concern is with evidence. The use of evidence in academic debate is very important to the process in the round and the outcome as represented by the decision. "Inserted" arguments are not given nearly the weight that "evidenced" arguments are, while at the same time judges will accept counter-intuitive arguments more often if they are accompanied by evidence. Thus, debaters who would "manufacture" evidence or "distort" evidence which does exist would stand a far better chance at winning debate rounds.

Concern about evidence is certainly not new in academic debate. In
the sixties, for example, as evidence became more prominent, various studies were undertaken to "backtrack" evidence in order to find out how much of it was "real" and how much as "unethical." Every debater has stories about someone they knew, debated with, or heard about who utilized evidence unethically, but it is rather hard to verify such stories. What is possible to examine, however, is the transcript of the final round of the National Debate Tournament, annually printed in the Journal of the American Forensic Association. The complete sources for all evidence are supposedly provided by the teams involved, and the evidence is backtracked and then reported on in the footnotes accompanying the transcript. While not wanting to make specific charges, I think it is safe to say that in several instances (1964, 1969, 1970, 1972, 1975 and 1970) some problems have been confronted with the evidence. My intuitive feeling is that, if examples can be found in the final round of the NDT, and if it is a concern so much on people's minds, there certainly must be a number of instances of such unethical use of evidence which are not reported. Based on experience gained through debating, coaching high school and college debate, cross-checking evidence from debate handbooks, and editing a number of debate handbooks myself, ethical problems in evidence are not uncommon in
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academic debate. The second ethical concern deals with the procedures during a debate round. Specifically, it is possible that the honesty criteria can be and at times is violated during a debate. For example, the time-keeping procedures may be dishonestly manipulated. A team member who is entrusted with timing the speech of his/her partner may find it advantageous to give his/her colleague an extra thirty seconds in a rebuttal speech. While often timing problems arise out of simple error (forgetting to announce the time, not watching the clock, using the wrong time limits, etc.), this can be an ethical concern as well. Another problem which might take place during a round is inaccurate reporting of what has been done in other speeches. For example, a rebuttalist might claim that the other team "had no answer" for a given position, when in fact they did, and thus claim to have won the argument on that basis. Again, while faulty memory and faulty flowcharting might be an explanation for this, there is some concern that this may be done "on purpose" in an attempt to gain the decision. Another possible ethical violation might involve the malicious misrepresentation of their own position by teams. An example illustrates my precise point here. If a negative team asks to see a brief read by an affirmative team, the affirmative may hand over a brief which is NOT the original one read in the debate, but a weak step-sister of the original block. The negative will then attack this brief on the basis of faults on THEIR copy, while the judge asking to see the same block at the end of the round would be shown the proper brief. Another example would be a negative debater who, having read a contradictory piece of evidence in a rebuttal speech, denies that any such card was read when questioned about it. Both of
these examples, while sounding a bit far-fetched, come from my personal experiences as a coach and a judge, so they do have a basis in fact.

A third category of ethical problems involves the judging of the debate. A judge, for example, may willingly vote for the team he/she actually thought lost the round because of some perverse reason. This might involve benefiting their own team, exacting revenge on a team/coach he/she dislikes, or because one team has substantially more "reputation" than another, so no one who did not see the debate would question the decision since the "favorite" won. Another example would be a situation where an event arranger would assign a judge to a round because he/she knew of the biases at work and wanted to aid one team or another, thus attempting to "stack the deck." As already indicated in the discussion of ethics in chapter three, a judge should be willing to be open about his/her motives in judging, a criteria which Wallace has identified as being applicable to all public communication.

While these three concerns represent my viewpoint, very real and pressing concerns in academic debate, others have gone much farther. Often it is popular to brand any practice one does not care for as "unethical." For example, several coaches I have great respect for now were the same ones who indicated seven or eight years ago that certain

practices were "unethical" which are now clearly admissible. Some of these supposed "ethical" violations are considered here.

First, some argue that a coach has a clearly defined "ethical" role, and should not exceed it. For example, some argue that coaches should not do research, should not aid students in constructing arguments, and should not go over the flowcharts or other teams have judged. While these may be valid concerns when carried to extremes by any coach, they do not seem to involve a violation of any criteria or honesty.

Second, some argue that anything other than random assignment of judges is unethical. At many tournaments, the event arranger will rank order judges, and then assign the better judges to those rounds which have the most bearing on the outcome of the tournament competition. Many argue that this is unfair, discriminatory, and leads to rampant elitism. Frankly, I find this hard to view as an ethical violation. If tournament organizers advertised random judge assignment and then proceeded to assign them on the basis of their quality, this would be a violation of honesty. But when the assignment of judges on the basis of perceived quality is announced and communicated to teams and judges, there seems to be little violation of honesty. The reason judges are placed in this manner seems clear to me -- debaters and coaches want it that way. These parties are concerned that the best possible judges be put into each round, and certainly this is a greater concern when the round is more important. It is not unusual for a judge who dislikes
being assigned on a "skill" basis (perhaps because of low skill levels, which means judging assignments to lower quality and less important debates) complain that his/her team(s) did not get a good judge in a given round when it was an important or "break" round. In almost all games, judges are assigned on the basis of their skill levels. For example, the umpires during a world series are chosen as the best umpires during that season, and are rewarded by this assignment. Shouldn't we attempt to skill match for the benefit of all involved? Certainly, this is an area of legitimate concern for many, yet it hardly seems an "ethical" concern.

A final supposed charge of ethics violation involves the use of a new and unfamiliar strategy. Whenever a team comes up with a new way to approach issues so that they have a greater chance of winning, certain parties are bound to claim that this is "unethical." For example, when Lichtman, Garvin and Corsi proposed the "alternative justification" case which allowed the affirmative to "drop" entire action planks of their plan, many responded that this was "unethical," probably because they did not know how to answer it yet. One of my favorite personal examples was an affirmative team who was experiencing their first counterplan. They argued that since they didn't know much about counterplans, it was "unethical" to argue one against them. The
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response by the negative was that the lack of knowledge on the part of their opponents was hardly an "ethical" violation on their part. I am sure that every new technique which has emerged, from the independent advantage to the generic disadvantage, has been subjected to this criticism. Rather than being unethical, such practices are merely "new," and debaters have not thought out answers to them yet. For example, a certain practice might be "unfair" (providing a theoretical advantage to one side over the other, thus violating the equal opportunity criteria applied to procedures in chapter three), while not being "unethical." The two concepts, fairness and ethics, are blurred in many instances or this sort of argumentation.

Of all of the criticisms of modern debate, the charge of ethical problems is perhaps the most compelling. Fortunately, gaming offers a very interesting and productive way to study and regulate ethics. Turning to the literature of game theory and game/simulation, we find a lot of attention devoted to ethical issues.

Schelling contends that ethical behavior has a lot in common with gaming. As an example of this, Schelling discusses the implications of dishonesty and how lying can be related to gaming. Citing Piaget, Schelling reported that children aged 10-12 years, when

questioned about lying, noted that truthfulness was necessary for reciprocity and mutual agreement. "Deceiving others destroys mutual trust." Schelling contends that children find truth socially useful, and that children have freely adopted a rule against lying. Schelling goes on to compare lying to game theory. He notes:

Lying, after all, is suggestive of game theory. It involves at least two people, a liar and somebody who is lied to; it transmits information, the credibility and veracity of which are important; it influences some choice another is to make that the liar anticipates; the choice to lie or not to lie is part of the liar's choice of strategy; the possibility of a lie presumably occurs to the second party, and may be judged against some a priori expectations; and the payoff configurations are rich in possibilities, since a lie can be told for the good of the victim, the truth can be told to pave the way for a later lie, and a lie can even be told with the intention that it not be believed.

Thus, gaming can provide some interesting new perspectives on lying and the behavior surrounding lying. Several reasons explain ways in which gaming approaches issues of honesty. First, gaming can help in studying the situation surrounding such behavior. For example, Fletcher notes that in different situations, lying may be permissible. For example, "if a small neighborhood merchant tells a lie to divert some "protection" racketeers from their victims, no matter how compassionately the lie is told, he has chosen to do evil according to certain intrinsicalist ethics, though it might be considered a lesser


evil." Fletcher scorns this, and notes that in some situations, such as this one, "it is not inexcusably evil, it is positively good." This is not to suggest that in certain debate situations lying is good, but it does indicate that any approach to ethics must recognize the "extrinsic" position of Fletcher, that the situation plays an important part in determining the ethical nature of an action. Schelling has noted that one must evaluate the consequences of an act, including the consequences on the behaviors of others, and one must be personally responsible for evaluating those consequences. Gaming is not an answer to ethical problems, but it does provide a useful way of evaluating situation ethics. As Schelling notes, "it may be too early to credit game theory with much help, but surely there is promise." His summary of Fletcher's position is that in the language of game theory, the situation ethic does not content itself with prescribing individual strategies but requires us to scan the entire matrix, evaluating each outcome, and attending to the preferences of others. "it is not the deed, but its intended (expected) consequences, by which morality is to be judged. Ignorance is no excuse; one must think through the consequences and evaluate them, if necessary, predicting the behavior of others." The point seems to be that if all parties adhere to the ethic of honesty, then debate can serve as an open forum to explore the situational nature of ethical questions. Honesty is certainly not the
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only ethic in the game or debate, but it is the only non-situational ethic. Other ethics are worthy of exploration, but they do not apply to all situations in a debate round. Through the ethic of honesty we can engage in a situationally specific discussion of ethics. Thus, gaming allows us to better understand the situational nature of ethics.

Second, gaming allows us to study how concern for other individuals guides our sense of ethics. One assumption that some have made about competitive games is that players will utilize strategies which only involve their self interest. Actually, it has become apparent that players develop concerns for other participants, which can be thought of as a function of ethics. Schelling has noted that some believe that rationality, as exhibited by players, is to be identified with selfishness. Disagreeing with this, he writes:

This argument, I think, is not usually valid. There is no need to suppose that the payoffs reflect selfish interests. They reflect the player's valuation of the outcomes, and he can surely value them selfishly, altruistically, or in terms of justice or welfare. If a game reflects a lawyer's choice of strategy, the lawyer can be playing to maximize his fee, to get an innocent man acquitted, or to establish a precedent that he believes to be in the interest of justice. He may do this out of fun, pride, or ethical obligation, or to get revenge on an opposing attorney.

Rapoport has also concluded that players are often vitally concerned with the welfare of other players. In summarizing empirical research in this area, he notes that, "Players are often concerned not only with
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their own payoffs but also with what the co-player gets, sometimes empathizing with him, sometimes, on the contrary, deriving satisfaction from his losses, regardless of what they themselves get." The point here is that gaming recognizes that significant pressures will operate to make players concerned about the welfare of other players. For example, a team clearly winning a round might have a tendency to show mercy on the other team by easing up a bit, a tendency debate coaches live in fear of. Certainly not all will show such concern, but it is hoped that a gaming perspective can continually bring out more and more of such concern.

Third, gaming is a useful perspective for investigating how to deter ethical violations. Schelling has stated that gaming can be a very useful tool in examining deterrence as it might arise in capital punishment, international threats of military retaliation, and more generally in the whole realm of rewards and punishments. Various methods can be explored and evaluated in terms of how to increase the motives for ethical behavior on the part of players. His suggestion, which might be considered for application to academic debate, is massive retaliation. Thus, unethical practices could be deterred if massive penalties (such as losing a ballot) were arranged. His hope is that deterrence will be effective, and thus massive retaliation will not be necessary in the vast majority of instances. This is certainly an area
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where more investigation is warranted in an attempt to relate gaming approaches of deterrence to the control of unethical debate practices.

The conclusion drawn from these points and other issues not covered here must be that gaming and game theory can provide a useful method of understanding and dealing with ethical difficulties. Schelling notes that substantial area exists for the utilization of game theory and the study of ethics, including ethical problems game theory has already addressed, the use of game theory can be expanded into the discipline of ethics and philosophy, and finally that the conduct of a game itself is likely to give rise to new ethical concerns for study. Schelling observes that game theory can study ethics as a constraint on human behavior. Such constraints can come from religion, ethics, law, instinct, sentiment, taste, the nervous system and other parts of the human body, custom, the physical environment, and the contrivances we equip ourselves with. As well, game theory can be especially helpful in examining constraints that affect "people's expectations about each other, for working out the social-behavioral implications of different ethical systems." Certainly this last ability is one of special import to academic debate. Ethical systems can be examined, according to
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by looking at the interactive implications of ethical systems, how changes in constraints and payoffs make particular rules unnecessary or essential, and to examine the implications of coexistence between two radically different ethics.

There are a number of reasons why the ethics of a game situation matches up well with the ethics of an academic debate situation. 

Duke, for example, has stated that a game is well suited to handling ethical concerns if it has a neutral, non-manipulative design. Certainly the game of debate briefly outlined in chapter three attempts to meet this criteria, especially by stressing the need for equality of opportunity among players. Schelling has observed that a game is well suited for handling ethical issues if it involves direct consequences or ethical choices. Certainly in academic debate, the possibility of losing a ballot on an ethical issue (such as proven fabrication of evidence) does provide the needed consequences. Vaianakis has posited that ethical issues are explored when the welfare of others is inter-related. Certainly in an academic debate,
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each player has the welfare of his/her partner and the school to think of, as well as the welfare of an opponent he/she might violate ethical standards in competition against.

This does not mean that there will be no ethical problems in the game or debate, nor does it mean that ethical difficulties can be defined outside of actual play. As Duke notes, "new ethical problems may emerge in the use of a game." When ethical problems do develop, it is best to let the operator (in this case, the judge) merely observe how ethical disputes are played out in the round. In the best spirit of table rasa, the debaters should decide by their argument. Duke notes that the "simplest, most straightforward rule is that the operator should blend into the woodwork at the earliest possible moment and let the game proceed with a minimum of operator intervention." Thus, in a debate, ethical disputes are open to argument.

A couple of issues need to be raised in pre-emption to possible arguments against the position that gaming can operate as a way to approach ethics within academic debate. One would be that ethics is necessarily connected with values, and values are very rarely discussed in a debate context. It seems less than sage to argue that values are
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EVER excluded from intellectual concerns. As Bremer notes, intellectual curiosity probably cannot exist without moral concern. Certainly issues such as politics and economics, often discussed in debates, have important ethical components. As Schelling has noted, it is not possible to abstract "ethical man" as separate from "economic man" and "rational man." These concepts are related. Academic debate provides a fertile area for a discussion of ethics, values, and morals. Another objection may be that not all will be willing to play the game ethically. Of course, this is true. However, the implication must not be that this demonstrates that gaming is a failure at studying ethics, but means that gaming is a fertile area for ethical study because not all will obey the same set of applied ethical standards. As Schelling notes, when we develop a sort of "social contract" between players to play the game "ethically," we "must take as a premise that not everybody will sign the contract."

Ethical concerns are prevalent in academic debate, both in a discussion of the issues implied by the topics, and by the practices which emerge in academic debates. Gaming provides not an answer, but a feasible methodology for handling the study of such ethical disputes.
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CHAPTER SIX
THE FUTURE OF DEBATE

It is not enough to evaluate the problems which exist in academic debate and then resolve them, a task attempted in chapter five. If a gaming perspective is to have value, it must also point the way towards how academic debate can improve itself. This chapter attempts to examine the question of where academic debate is said to be going and now gaming provides a promise of a better activity.

A. ACADEMIC DEBATE AT A CROSSROADS?

Certainly a number of observers of academic debate feel that it is at a "crossroads." One is, of course, a bit suspicious of the use of that term. It implies that change takes place in discrete units by symbolizing that we have come to a fork in the road, and that we must pick one way or another. This is the sort of mutual exclusivity that has led to an improper view of the paradigms in academic debate -- we are tempted to see them as either/or propositions, while the perspective of gaming calls for an assimilation of the paradigms. As well, many of the claims of an "hour of crisis" for academic debate have not been proven by the passage of time. As we saw in the last chapter, there have been doomsayers in academic debate for decades. For example, Kovalcneck notes that the "information explosion" in debate began in 1970 and reached its zenith in 1980. Yet, in 1970 Brockriede is already complaining about the information explosion, noting that debaters have
become "well oiled machines." These arguments were dealt with in chapter four, but the point needs to be made about the time frame involved. Can we say that Kovalcheck's picture of doom will be any more accurate than Brockriede's? The winter, 1980 issue of Speaker and Gavel is concerned with the issue of "Forensics in the Eighties." The contents, as one might imagine, literally teem with the sorts of criticisms and predictions of doom one has become relatively familiar with. An interesting perspective on the nature of the charges in that issue comes from Williams. He writes:

The only prediction for which I will be willing to be held accountable is that most of the predictions we hear about intercollegiate forensics in the '80's will not come true. Just as the '70's survived the dire predictions of many people, so will the '80's. Changes will occur but I suspect that they will not be of the magnitude and perhaps not even in the direction we may predict.

Predictions based on matters of taste (how fast debaters should talk, how much evidence they should read, how others might react) are probably not very relevant.

However, there are some predictions about academic debate which can be safely made. These predictions stem from the fact that debate is linked to academic institutions. As these institutions prosper and suffer, so academic debate will share their fate. Needless to say, the demographic effects of the "baby boom," the problems of inflation and
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calls for "budget cuts" may have a deleterious effect on the financial capacity of many high schools, colleges and universities, and thus will probably lead to some budget readjustments for academic debate. These adjustments will, no doubt, lead to numerous complaints by those involved. This is natural. We really must assume that academic debate will use all of the resources which it finds available to it. Academic debate will spend what it has, ask for more, and complain when funds are taken from it. This is probably true of most human institutions. It is specifically true of gaming. As Duke has indicated, "Games, whether in design, construction or use, will absorb all time and resources available." We probably need to realize that debate must depend on EXTERNAL regulation of its funding, or else it might gorge itself needlessly on resources.

A complaint accompanying that of funding cuts is "lagging student interest." As was indicated in chapter four, many feel that the "unreal" nature of debate and the amount of work necessary turn many students from the activity. This may be the case in some instances, though not to the extent imagined. It is, however, true of almost all educational activities which students may choose. Medicine might be more popular if it was easier to study, just as speech courses might be more popular if they used gaming and simulation more. Certainly any activity draws students if it is enjoyable and educationally rewarding.

Different forms of education and different subject matters require different levels of student effort and involvement. Many fields of study are difficult, yet they continue to draw students because they may be seen as being worth the effort. Thus, if debate is too time-consuming, making it easier and simpler is not the only approach to take. Perhaps a more vigorous effort made by forensic educators to justify why such effort is worthwhile would be in order.

There are fewer students in schools now, so there are probably fewer students involved in debate. This is a demographic reality. Perhaps those who believe both that debate cannot survive budget cutbacks and that student participation is dropping need to link these two issues together. One might certainly be the cause or the other. The answer to funding problems may be in increasing student involvement. One can achieve student involvement if the activity offered is coherent, educational, and enjoyable. It is from this perspective that gaming offers itself as an overarching paradigm. Gaming's ability to involve students is an important feature.

6. GAMING AND THE FUTURE OF ACADEMIC DEBATE

1. GAMING AND POPULARITY

America has, in the last ten to twenty years, experienced a "game boom." In many different forms, games are becoming more and more prevalent in our society. In terms of the interests of students, most
of us are already familiar with such common games as "Dungeons & Dragons," sports simulations, various war games, and the proliferation of electronic video games. American youth are very interested in games and gaming.

Gaming has also been utilized in a large number of purely academic fields. Bremer notes that they have been used in economics, sociology, psychology, and organizational behavior. In fact, a survey of the literature up to only 1969 revealed almost 1,000 publications which contained a description of a working simulation model or game.

Duke has found a rapidly rising curve in game use in the social sciences. Game growth is now incredibly rapid. Duke constructed this curve from an accumulation of his personal files and after confirmation from others in the field such as Zuckerman and Horn.

As an example of the analytic power of gaming, it has been used extensively, though often unknowingly, by anthropologists. Anthropologists AND game theorists Atkins and Curtis observe that the historically dominant and still important concern of the cultural anthropologist has been with the analogues, in culture at large, of game
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rules or ground rules that have to do with structuring the basic cultural framework within which decisions are made. Certainly this sort of interdisciplinary analysis through gaming is also easily applied to academic debate, as we have seen.

2. THE PROMISE OF A "NEW" DEBATE USING GAMING

An attempt has been made in this work concerning how gaming relates to the survival and future direction of academic debate. First, gaming can provide us with an answer to the charges of excess which are often made against academic debate. Seeing debate as a game, and using an open-minded analysis of what one sees in a debate round and in the world at large, these charges can either be dismissed, accounted for, or most effectively dealt with from a perspective of gaming. Second, as well as having a more appropriate role in academic institutions because of its acceptability and trans-disciplinary nature, gaming also provides us with a positive and logical link to the communication discipline. Gaming must be viewed as a complex communication activity, and thus should be highly acceptable in our discipline.

However, there are two especially important benefits which gaming has to offer which have been referred to, but never specifically
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developed, in this work. They are the simple notions that a gaming perspective will provide us with a better educational tool and a richer forum for theoretical work and progress.

a. IMPROVED EDUCATIONAL IMPACT

Some have expressed dismay that gaming has not led to the construction of simple models for social phenomena such as war, war planning, power politics, and business planning. Rapoport has observed that these hopes were doomed to failure, since the game is really too simple to handle these difficulties. Simple answers are rarely found to highly complex problems. If gaming can't provide a way to solve world problems, or very many real problems at all, what good is it? While gaming does have some very real benefits scientifically, its main attraction is its ability to serve as an educational tool.

Duke has developed a spiral model of learning as related to gaming. He views learning as a spiral, where each concentric movement of 360 degrees represents "the logical acquisition of knowledge about a new topic, characterized by completeness at a given level of detail." The distance between the spiral rings can be thought of as the passage of time. Each completed ring implies an integrity of perspective to the knowledge acquired, and provides the starting point or context for the

---

next ring. Duke believes that this is relevant to gaming's ability to teach about complex systems because: (1) it points out the necessity for establishing context before learning can take place, and (2) it describes a learning process which synthesizes increasing detail into overviews or iterative gestalts. Duke believes that gaming fits into this spiral very well. Games proceed by permitting players to build up a more complete conceptual map during successive rounds of play. Games iterate both in the cycle of one game run and in a cycle of game runs one after another. As discussed earlier, players themselves go through cycles of learning, involvement, experimentation, and evaluation. In terms of describing the cyclical nature of self-guided education in a game, Duke seems to be making a point which can be easily related to debate when he writes,

> Once players are involved...the process of learning takes place automatically. In a good game players will explore the system presented on their own volition. They will seek to find answers to questions that they themselves have generated. This means that the operator's role is relatively limited.

Others have recognized this process in academic debate. Huenner notes that "the more important debate is the one which takes place in the debater's mind as he considers for himself, over the course of many weeks, the strengths and weaknesses of the affirmative and negative
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positions." In summarizing his position, Duke has found that the rich learning possibilities to be found in games stem from two characteristics. First, the game is an environment for self-instruction, permitting simultaneous multiple-sensing from different perspectives in a safe environment, and conveying neuristics (general and structural learning) in a responsive environment. Second, the iterative character of games permits enlarged perception and logical mental closure with each iteration, permitting an emphasis on gestalt (the establishment of a context as perceived to be relevant to the player) and reality testing through formal critiques. The educational literature also demonstrates that gaming has the characteristics necessary for learning. Moore and Anderson state that there are four principles underlying the design of good educational environments. Both academic debate and gaming in general share these characteristics.

(1) Perspectives principle - A given environment is more productive if it permits and facilitates the taking of more perspectives towards the problems than another environment. (2)
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Autotelic principle - The environment must be safe for experimentation or even the most outrageous and improbable sort without high personal risk. (3) Productive principle - This implies the ability of the learner to deduce or make probable inference within the context of the educational environment. This requires an environment which is logically and coherently structured, permitting the learner to make leaps of faith to some other perspective or level of thought. (4) Personalization principle - That environment is most productive which permits the greatest responsiveness to the learner's activities; it is an environment that encourages the learner first to find a question then to find an answer.

Duke concludes that "games specifically "apply the four principles suggested..." by Moore and Anderson, whether through intuition or deliberate design.

In an effort to determine which instructional methods were "most productive," Goodlad engaged in an exhaustive survey of the literature and original empirical survey. His conclusions tend to bear out the analysis we have been presenting here. He notes, "Research to date suggests that the most productive instructional methods combine "interaction" models with "social systems" models." It seems clear that academic debate does this: it involves students in an interactive discussion about social systems.

Having established that games are useful ways to teach students, we
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must deal with the issue of what they are being taught. To me, the game of debate is useful as an educational tool because it teaches gestalt and because it teaches the value of free speech.

First, students are being taught gestalt. While we have discussed this topic at some length, it is important to remember that a game, and specifically academic debate, must teach more than details. What students need are not new lists of data to memorize, but general habits of mind. Combs has noted that we need to teach humanistic objectives, such as creativity, adaptability, responsibility, independence, positive views of self, and formulations of values. His warning, should these be neglected, is clear.

Schools that do no more than teach people to read, write, and calculate will fail us all. Our society can get along much better with a bad reader or a bad mathematician than it can with an unintelligent citizen, or persons characterized by irresponsibility, dependence, hostility, or lack of concern for other people. Humanistic objectives are an absolute essential for the kind of society we live in.

In pointing the way for education in the future, Goodlad concurs.

What we need now in schooling is to move FROM the process of

366

369

370
Goodlad, p. 63.
reductionism that takes complex human goals and processes and fragments them into measurable but relatively unimportant learning activities that are only remotely related to the important ideas with which we began. What we need to turn toward are approaches to learning rich in opportunities to derive varied meanings and to devise creative, individual approaches to understanding and problem solving.

Equipped with insufficient gestalt learning, the society the citizen creates is a nightmare, but one we are all familiar with. Duke describes it this way:

Because of the lack of gestalt communication modes and therefore the lack of an integrated or holistic perspective, society's management of such complexity has consisted of four concurrent dimensions: false dichotomies, professional elitism, increasing dependency on technology, and gigantism. The inevitable, but false, dichotomies appear first: the bureaucrat parses out of the total fabric of society some element of great urgency, since he can neither understand nor solve the problem in its totality. But by attacking the problem piecemeal other evils are encountered, the least of which may be inefficiency, and most dangerous irrelevancy. As the bureaucracy transforms life into disconnected cells, programs often fail to achieve their purpose. Worse yet, the proposed solution may create problems which did not exist initially. These dichotomies breed the armies of a professional elite, and their empires and the resultant bureaucratic gigantism smother the citizen.

While not an answer to man's predicament by itself, the use of gaming to teach gestalt is certainly a starting point. As Duke has written, "...gaming is a powerful new form of communication, particularly suited for conveying gestalt."
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Goodman has called this gestalt learning "indirect non-essentialism." Indirect procedures are those in which the student is in a relatively active role; he/she ACQUIRES an education through a process of DISCOVERING for him/herself. As essentialism is seen as the conviction that there is a more or less discrete and complete body of facts and concepts, the absorption of which constitutes an education, non-essentialist methods would tend to stress general intellectual operations, habits of mind, as their central focus. Goodman notes that this sort of educational experience is rarely round, and then only among the very bright. He sees great potential, however, for gaming to provide such opportunities to more students. A student in such a situation would proceed very much on his/her own to learn about matters, the import of which he/she determines. At the outer limit there is no help from a teacher, but between the outer limit and indirect essentialism there lies a range of guided discovery that is non-essentialistic. "Members of a research team teach each other in this way; dissertation chairmen guide their students in this way; and some of the most interesting kinds of academic games guide their players in this way."

As Duke Notes, gaming teaches a "flexible set of highly abstract conceptual tools which will let the participant view new and emerging

situations, having no precedent, in a way that permits comprehension."

We have seen that the linkage and correspondence between academic debate and gaming is clear. Surely the educational purposes of academic debate can be furthered by a gaming perspective.

There is a second, important item of educational content to be learned from the game of academic debate. This involves teaching students about the importance of free speech. A debater who engages over and over again in organized arguments with opponents begins to understand the value of discussion and the realities of disagreement. Huebner has written,

"What debate ultimately teaches its participants... is that there are no easy answers, that men of good will can disagree vigorously about policy questions and still remain men of good will. When one has a feel for how the world looks from another vantage point, one then can accept different positions more readily... Because he has been on both sides of the gap, he is best qualified to measure its distance and to engineer its crossing."

Huebner believes that debaters become more humble before the issues as a result of debate training. When one's mind is trained to look for the hidden weakness in an argument, it becomes more difficult to "defend a position thoughtlessly or to advocate a point dogmatically." He goes on to note that it is much harder to believe that your adversary is..."
irresponsible, immoral, evil, or incompetent when those who have opposed you in argument "have been your good friends and when you have grown so accustomed to thinking, as your opponents struggle with your contentions, -- "there but for the flip of the coin go I." The endless iterations of the free speech process in the game of debate conditions debaters to respect that freedom and to use it wisely. The game of debate invites students to have their say, and in the process learn how to understand the how and the why of what others may say.

377 Rapaport has compared this particular process of a debate to the permissive therapy concept of Carl Rogers. Rapaport contends that the primary goal should be the creation of mutual understanding through the debate process, and that this goal should be achieved through a removal of any threat existing between the parties. This should proceed through three steps, which are taken from Rogers. First, conveying to the opponent that he has been heard and understood. "This is a principal component of permissive psychotherapy. The assumption is that the often novel experience of being heard and understood without being judged (in this case, by the opponent) opens up potentialities of mobilizing his inner resources... in a debate situation, it would seem that the inclination to listen and to understand can be stimulated only by
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imparting the experience of being heard and understood. Second, delineating the region of validity of the opponent's stand. "It is usual in debate to point out grounds for considering the position of the opponent INVALID. ...this procedure must be reversed. ...by delineating the conditions under which the opponent's point of view is VALID, we imply the residual conditions, under which it is NOT VALID. But the emphasis is on the former, not on the latter." Third, inducing the assumption of similarity. "Having shown the opponent that we can see his image and that we recognize the contexts in which this image is valid or inevitable, we must invite him to perform the same exercise with respect to us. This is the hardest task in the debate. ...The object is to induce the opponent to assume that you are like him; that if he feels that he deserves to be believed and trusted, then you can also be believed or trusted..." It is interesting to put the hopes of Rapoport for the assumption of similarity next to the point made by Huebner, that debate teaches respect for freedom of speech and mutual understanding. In general, Rapoport concludes that a meaningful debate must include some level of mutual understanding in this sense, and that this contributes to the ability of the debate situation to create cooperation among opponents.

An additional consideration in regard to the educational potential of gaming is the ability of gaming to find the proper role for the debate "coach." It is interesting that this term is almost universal in academic debate: if one wishes to question whether academic debate has, unseen, become a game, one might wonder at the use of the "coaching"
within educational gaming, the role of the coach is clear. Goodman notes that by virtue of the illustration of a "coach," one can readily see the teaching relationship involved in educational games. "It is precisely because games have rules...that players are guided to discoveries which we cannot assume they would make if they were interacting at random with a set of people or even a set of objects." Goodman notes that it is difficult to argue that a player learns only what his/her coach teaches him. The coach provides direction and instruction in the principles of the game, and then the student learns by noting the consequences of his/her own actions within the structure provided by the game.

The type of "guided discovery" in games which Goodman is emphasizing comes from the role of the coach -- not to instruct totally, but to guide towards self-learning and self-improvement. Goodman illustrates it by noting that a coach will supply not only knowledge of specific rules, but a thorough understanding of the implications of a given set of moves and strategies. The performance, however, is linked more to the choice within this rule structure that each player makes along with his/her opponent, and not so much a function of what the coach has said and done. Everything he/she receives from the coach is
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"something to be tested and evaluated (even a formal game rule); it is not to be accepted as an ultimate simply because the coach favors it, or insists on it." Beyond just guiding discovery, the coach should teach the complete individual. Goodman concludes,

It is no accident that Plato commended athletic games, or that English public schools find games so important a part of their traditional curriculum. It might be objected that these commendations are based exclusively on a recognition of the importance of physical training. To this, we must respond by recommending careful observation of the variety of educational methods employed by the effective coach. It is clearly not only to muscular agility that a coach addresses his concern. He is as concerned about the agility of the whole athlete, possession of an agile and inquiring mind, a mind that chooses confidently, though tentatively, among a limited range of alternatives. It is not at all unusual for an athlete to perform far better than his coach could, but most athletes know that they owe this self-realization, in large measure, to the structured guidance provided by the coach.

It would seem valid to argue that concern for this "wholeness" is essential. Students who ask debate coaches to guide them in an educational experience often demonstrate very human characteristics, as do the coaches who attempt to work with them. Attempts to be "all things to all people," however, are bound to fail on occasion, especially since some students are attracted to academic debate with great enthusiasm, while many students are not attracted to it at all. Debate coaching would seem to be a "high risk" educational activity, in that teachers are asked to work with so many aspects of a student's
development, as Freely's list would probably have us do. Viewing the teaching responsibilities of the ALREADY accepted debate coach role within the framework of gaming can only increase our knowledge of the potential of academic debate to serve the needs of students.

D. IMPROVED THEORETICAL WORK

Much of the substance of this entire work has been a critique of the literature in academic debate. While it is clear that a number of very intelligent writers have addressed issues of academic debate theory, one is nevertheless somewhat disappointed in the gross body of literature -- the paucity of good, volume length theoretical pieces, the absence of substantial empirical work in a field with so many game runs, the limited number of debate theory articles in journals closely aligned with academic debate, etc.

There is, of course, good reason for this. Primarily, academic debate is a competitive activity, and those who are in the forefront of theorizing (students, judges and coaches) usually do not have the time or the inclination to "write" at length about their conceptualizations of debate theory. While this is regrettable, it is also understandable. Zarefsky has noted that research and theoretical work has never been the strong suit of forensics. He notes, "in part, or course, it reflects the extremely heavy demands on one's time, with a combination of teaching, coaching, travel, and administrative duties that wogies the
However, another factor is the state of the existing body of debate theory literature. As we surveyed in chapter one, there are serious problems with all of the paradigms for academic debate, with literally NONE of them providing a close fit with what happens in a debate. The theoretical base is basically fragmented and in dispute. Little wonder, since the debaters and the coaches use today's "paradigms" as strategic moves in a broader game of debate. While the evolution into a "game" is quickly completing, very little has been written about it. There needs to be, of course, some unifying influence in order for theoretical work and research to improve.

The point to be made in this section is simple: if theorists in academic debate could agree on some broader principles, from my perspective being those of gaming, then theoretical work might proceed with better order and direction.

While not specifically advocating gaming, Zarefsky has contended that more theoretical clarity is necessary for meaningful research to take place. He notes that even a more deliberate approach to research will only bring us up against the theoretical barrier. He summarizes that barrier as follows: "As a field, we lack clarity or consensus as to the object of our study -- what, in brief, is the relationship between

The result of this lack of direction is indicated by Zarefsky: research tends not to be programmatic (in that it does not build on itself but merely strikes out blindly in the dark); that scholars allow particular interests in competitive activities to guide their research instead of overarching theoretical questions; that empirical studies lack theoretical foundation, and thus provide data, and even in some cases support hypotheses, but these results are never related to any coherent theoretical structure. The result is a poorly developed theoretical foundation for academic forensics and a poor body of research. Zarefsky spells out the results we can expect from such a situation, since "...without a strengthened commitment to scholarship, we will have a difficult time convincing our colleagues that forensics is a field with intellectual integrity warranting their respect. And, what is more, we will fail to advance the understanding of the argumentative perspective as a way to study communication."

While not existing as a panacea for this situation, research into paradigms for forensics can act as a step in the right direction. Clarification of the paradigm case can better organize forensic theory.
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and lead to improved research and scholarship. As Zarefsky writes,

One promising effort is the attempt in recent years to view forensic activities as reflecting some more general type of communicative behavior which serves as the paradigm case. When we investigate how contest activities may be modeled after policy-making, system-analytic, hypothesis-testing, or game-theoretic paradigms of human behavior, we actually may be contributing to broader questions about how argument functions as an instrument of knowledge and decision. Our answers are prompted by our concern for forensic activities but have a much more general application. We need in our work to give greater stress to the more general application.

Various game theorists have recognized the need for theoretical foundation for research. Game theorists Buchler and Nutini consider the concept of epistemological order which might be applied to this issue. They note that there may be a differentiation of knowledge into "primitive" and "derivative." They outline the task of the theory builder to be the arrangement of this knowledge into a systematic order. What is needed is a "systematic design of the devices or transformation rules that must mediate between purely formal constructs, the models if you wish, and the empirical world of social, psychological, and cultural relations." While this effort certainly cannot be thought of as achieving that goal, it certainly seems that gaming and game theory can provide us with new insights. Dubin notes that, likewise, there are two types of research that one can engage in; research directed at proving
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the model exists, and research working to improve the model. In academic debate we can hardly be said to be past the first stage, which is really only possible once some significant progress has been made on creating more acceptable models. Certainly the debate paradigms I have examined here indicate a debate theory in disarray. By assimilating all of the paradigms into one, unified structure, a game perspective should generate more research potential in the second area. Dubin notes that it is after such organization in theory that research can truly begin to develop in the finer details. As well, once some unifying characteristics have been adopted, according to Dubin, more combined research tasks can take place and all can find a place to contribute to an on-going body of theory.

Within a gaming approach to debate theory, there should be a great deal of player-designer interaction. Duke provides an interesting discussion of player-designer interaction, which sounds surprisingly like an advisable format for debater-theoretician interaction.
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The game is iterative, involving cycles of play each of which mimics some real-world phase but varies in focus depending on the phase of information used to trigger multiline. Discussion is followed by decision, and decision by processing. These results must be reviewed during the critique players must be encouraged to focus on the reality (of the game). If there are challenges by the players, these must be resolved by offering evidence to sustain the model, or through the modification of the model to more accurately reflect the new understanding of reality.

This last sentence is precisely what has taken place in the progress of this work. There is a new reality in academic debate, and we need to adjust our theories to it. Our models for the debate round must more accurately reflect the emergence of the "new" debate.

There is little doubt that even given an extremely flexible overall structure for debate theory, which gaming certainly is, those interested in debate theory will advance the conceptual state of that body of knowledge.

Current debate paradigms tend to isolate those interested in academic debate theory from each other and from other disciplines. As indicated in chapter one, a scholar in another field might be a little disappointed if he/she went through the paradigms to find out what sort of symbolic structures and concepts academic debate utilized. Yet, an interdisciplinary emphasis is essential if gaming is to grow as a technique. Rapoport believes that theoretical and experimental work must continue together, yet the two need not be always linked. As we observe in relating the "practice" of debate to the "theory" of games, Rapoport's admonition must be needed: "Unexpected experimental results
or real life observations may instigate new lines of theoretical development."

C. CONCLUSIONS AND BEGINNINGS

In *Permanence and Change* Kenneth Burke illustrates the concept of "trained incapacity" through a simple wildlife analogy...the chicken and the trout and what they found out. Trout compete with other creatures in the biosphere for food. Trout who are particularly good at acquiring the best food, as in this case plump worms, often stand the best chance of surviving and propagating. This, however, isn't always the case. Those trouts most skilled in worm catching often find a fisherman's hook attached to that worm, thus making the skill of food gathering actually an incapacity. Perhaps a more brutal example is the chicken which comes every day when the farmer's wife rings the bell to receive corn and other treats, until one day when she rings the bell, the hatchet and the skillet are the rate of the obedient chicken. We are trained to survive, but how successful will be our survival when our previous habits become noxious? Are we to be the trouts or our own experience, caught cruelly because we are too well-skilled in particular tasks?

---


Of course, one has a gut feeling that such a rate just "isn't in the cards" for such as we, intelligent humans, able to see the interconnectedness of the biosphere and the strategies of survival... We know that too much is NOT a good thing. This might be an acceptable explanation, yet in many areas our actions defy this.

So it is with academic debate. As I have attempted to explain, the academic debate community adheres to and applies a given number of "paradigms" for the activity. These paradigms grab hold of different portions of the fabric of experience and try to apply it to the particular debate round at hand. Highly skilled judges, with years of training and a deep understanding of the debate process, apply their appropriate *mix* to making a decision. Various paradigms are seen as existing in opposition — in realms of mutual exclusivity fostered, no doubt, by the eagerness of particular teams to present them as either—or choices. Perhaps these highly trained and focused individuals have lost sight of the broad characteristics of the activity.

One wonders, however, what kind of insight one would hope to achieve from a broader perspective? The answer is simple. If you imagine yourself describing debate to someone who had never seen one before, the conclusion will be inescapable. Academic debate has:

- Two opposing teams, or two persons each.
- Judges who vote for a "winner" or "loser."
- Points are also assigned as "quality ratings."
- Time limits during which they may compete.

- Strategic moves which the other team must counter.

- An array of matches set up so that activity may take place in succession, in a tournament format.

- "Coaches" who work with and prepare specific teams.

Honestly, I find the proposition that academic debate is not a game to be almost unsupportable. As games are defined in the literature, and as academic debate is now being practiced in America, one really has to conclude that DEBATE HAS BECOME A GAME.

Trained incapacities recognized, there is an important question of survival. Will academic debate survive if it believes it is "testing the truth in hypotheses," or is "making policy?" If so, then unprepared for now we mean with the rest of the human experience, academic debate will be hauled to the shore and fried for dinner. If, however, we recognize academic debate for what it is now and what it can be within this framework, it may have a significant and important role to play in the intellectual life and future of our race. This last notion is not a promise or a prediction, but a possibility...and a possibility which we have every reason and every duty to explore.

This work has attempted to accomplish a very large task -- to evaluate the existing paradigms in academic debate, to propose a new paradigm, and then to spell out its impacts and implications. This has been attempted through several distinct steps, which will be summarized
Chapter one attempts to provide a general background to modern academic debate. Its nature and scope is briefly discussed. Each of the paradigms popular in academic debate are reviewed, both for their basic tenets and for their uses in debate rounds. Each paradigm is then subjected to critical scrutiny, with criticisms which are generally applicable and also which are specifically tailored to a given paradigm. The conclusion of this analysis is that academic debate is experiencing a paradigmatic crisis, a situation in which none of the existing paradigms can adequately explain the reality of academic debate or operate, in isolation, as workable theories. The search for a new paradigm is seen as justified.

Chapter two attempts to provide a background for the concept of gaming. Gaming is viewed as a form of human communication which is integrated in nature and future-oriented. Gaming is presented through an examination of the concept as used in game theory, anthropology, political science, education, and everyday life. Gaming is revealed as a widely used methodology for examining human behavior, as a form of communication gaming has specific benefits and applications which are discussed.

Chapter three attempts to spell out a new paradigm for academic debate — a "game of debate." Various principles of game design are reviewed, and then the game design process spelled out by Duke is
pursued in a step by step fashion until the full game is spelled out. Various techniques for applying a game are discussed. Throughout this attempt a remarkable relationship is observed between academic debate and gaming.

Chapter four attempts to apply the criticisms of the existing paradigms developed in chapter one to the gaming paradigm. Gaming is seen as a way to integrate the existing paradigms into a broader structure, thus utilizing the applicable portions of the existing paradigms without facing the necessity of demanding that each explain the entirety of the debate process. The result is that gaming not only integrates the existing paradigms but avoids the general charges made against the paradigms which are developed in chapter one.

Chapter five attempts to examine the criticisms directed at academic debate in general and respond to them from a game perspective. These criticisms include that modern debate is: not enough like real life; involves too much speed in communication; is too competitive; involves information overload; and has serious ethical problems in its implementation. The gaming approach to academic debate is capable of meeting all of these criticisms.

Chapter six has attempted to explain the future benefits which might accrue if gaming is utilized as a paradigm for academic debate. These benefits include the ideas that gaming might provide an improved educational impact for academic debate and that it may lead to improved theoretical work in academic debate.
Gaming can be justifiably seen as a paradigm for academic debate. As explained in this work, gaming is the most complete and applicable of the paradigms. Gaming fits remarkably well with the reality of academic debate today. Gaming tends to operate in a new relationship with the old paradigms, in that it subsumes them rather than calling for their rejection. Gaming also offers itself as an important cross-disciplinary tool, thus ending the isolation from other areas of study our current paradigms have forced us into. Gaming is also very closely linked to the specific discipline of communication, thus providing a relationship to the academic area where debate is most often found. Gaming is a powerful new tool which needs to be applied with rigor and open-mindedness to academic debate. The activity will benefit from such application.